

After the amendment was adopted, while the bill was in the Committee of the Whole, I secured a copy of it, and I found that it provides that whenever duties would otherwise be payable directly or indirectly from appropriations for the support of the Army, they should be remitted. That means, Mr. President, that if any company that has a contract to-day with the Government of the United States and imports goods into this country that would enter into the making of articles contracted for, they would be admitted into this country free of duty. That would relieve many of the contractors of the payment of millions of dollars, and as they have already bid upon the goods, and contracts have been made based upon the payment of the duty, it would enable contractors to make an additional profit equal to the amount of duty remitted. If it were not for that there would be some propriety in asking for the amendment. Again, Mr. President, I think the House would take exception to the Senate undertaking, on an appropriation bill, to amend the revenue laws.

Therefore, Mr. President, I make the point of order that this is general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I think the point of order ought to be sustained. I have no objection to its being sustained, and would like to have the item go out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained, and the section goes out.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m., Tuesday, March 12, 1918) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 13, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, March 12, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, our Heavenly Father, we lift up our hearts to Thee in gratitude for the genius of our Republic, handed down by our fathers and held sacred through all the vicissitudes of the past; for the great and fundamental principles in the Constitution of the United States, the embodiment of all that is sacred to our hearts—life, liberty, justice, fair play, and equal rights for all men.

We are now engaged in a gigantic struggle, not for conquest, not for gain, but in defense of those sacred rights. Unite us as a people, guide us by Thy counsels, and give victory to our arms, not only for ourselves but for the sake of all lovers of liberty, that a peace at last shall be established which shall make inviolate these sacred truths, and all praise be Thine, through Him, who disclosed the truth which makes all men free. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

TAXES ON INCOMES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the engrossed copy of the bill (H. R. 9248) to prevent extortion, to impose taxes upon certain incomes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, the third reading of which has been ordered.

The Clerk proceeded to read the engrossed copy of the bill.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the demand for the reading of the engrossed bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws the demand for the reading of the engrossed bill.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the following motion to recommit and ask that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TINKHAM moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the District of Columbia with instructions to report the same forthwith with an amendment striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the following:

"That in the interpretation and construction of this act the following rules shall be observed, namely:

"First. The term 'real estate' as herein used shall be construed to include lands, buildings, parts of buildings, houses, dwellings, apartments, rooms, suites of rooms, and every improvement and structure whatsoever, and every portion and part thereof, situated and being in the District of Columbia, and any and all estates and rights therein or thereto.

"Second. The word 'party' or 'person' shall include individuals, legal representatives of individuals, partnerships, joint-stock companies, associations, corporations, societies, bodies corporate, the Government of the United States in all its branches, departments, bureaus, boards, councils, and other agencies and instrumentalities, and all representatives, agencies, bodies, and instrumentalities acting for or in behalf of or employed or used by any and all foreign Governments not at war with

the United States, unless such construction would be unreasonable; and the reference to any officer shall include any person authorized by law, or by regulation made in accordance with this act, to perform the duties of his office.

"Third. Words importing the singular number shall be held to include the plural, and vice versa, except where such construction would be unreasonable.

"Fourth. Words importing the masculine gender shall be held to include all genders, except where such construction would be unreasonable.

"Fifth. The term 'rent' or 'rent from real estate' shall include any and all amounts received for the daily, weekly, monthly, yearly, or other periodical or term use or occupancy of real estate, or any part or multiple of any such periods of time.

"Sec. 2. That in addition to other taxes imposed by law there is hereby levied and shall be assessed, collected, and paid to the District of Columbia an annual tax of 100 per cent upon so much of the income from real estate of every person, whether resident or nonresident of said District, received from and after July 1, 1918, as exceeds the deductions herein allowed. For the purpose of ascertaining the amount of income subject to said tax there shall be deducted from the gross income reported as herein provided so much thereof as equals the lawful rent fixed and determined by the President or the rent income tax administrator, to be appointed as hereinafter provided, for the use and occupation of any real estate situated in the District of Columbia.

"Sec. 3. That the President is hereby authorized to appoint a rent income tax administrator, who shall be a citizen of the United States and a resident of the District of Columbia, who shall have full power and authority, and whose duty it shall be, under the direction of the President, to revise existing rents of real estate in the District of Columbia, and, by appropriate orders or rules, to fix the amounts of rents which it shall be lawful to charge, collect, and receive from real estate in the District of Columbia, which rents shall be uniform in so far as they apply to like pieces or parcels of real estate.

"Sec. 4. That it shall be the duty of the rent income tax administrator, on or before the 1st day of July, 1918, by specific order designating the real estate to be affected thereby, or by general order affecting groups or classes of pieces or parcels of real estate, to fix the amount of rent which it shall be lawful for the party entitled to charge, collect, and receive for all real estate situated in the District of Columbia then or thereafter rented, leased, subleased, used, or occupied by any party or person: *Provided*, That the President, in his discretion, may extend the time within which the rent income tax administrator shall so fix the amount of lawful rents for said real estate: *And provided further*, That any party in interest may prosecute an appeal from any order of the rent income tax administrator to the board of rent income tax appeals provided for in this act, under and in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be made respecting appeals; and until such appeal shall be decided by the board of rent income tax appeals the order of the rent income tax administrator, in so far as it affects the property described in the appeal, shall be superseded by the appeal.

"Sec. 5. That from and after the promulgation of the order of the rent income tax administrator fixing the lawful amounts of rents of real estate in the District of Columbia, as provided in section 4, it shall be unlawful and be a violation of this act for any person to charge or receive a greater rent than the amount so fixed.

"Sec. 6. That the President and the rent income tax administrator, under the direction of the President, are hereby authorized to make and promulgate such orders, rules, and regulations not inconsistent with this act as may be necessary or appropriate effectively to carry out the provisions of this act.

"Sec. 7. That the President is hereby authorized to appoint a board of rent income tax appeals consisting of three persons, who shall be citizens of the United States and residents of the District of Columbia. Said board of rent income tax appeals shall have the power to hear and determine any appeal from any order of the rent income tax administrator authorized by this act, and said board of rent income tax appeals shall have power, upon consideration of such appeal, by its order, to affirm or reverse the order of the rent income tax administrator, and in case of reversal thereof to increase, diminish, or otherwise modify the amount of rent fixed in the order of the rent income tax administrator, and the amount so fixed in the order of the board of rent income tax appeals shall be the amount of rent which can be lawfully charged and received for the use and occupation of the real estate affected thereby until the same shall be, upon new facts or other conditions, again changed and fixed by order of the rent income tax administrator or the board of rent income tax appeals, as the case may be: *Provided*, That no such further change shall be made within six months.

"Sec. 8. That on or before the 1st day of July, 1919, a true and accurate return, under oath, shall be made by every person subject to said tax, or his authorized agent, to the rent income tax administrator, setting forth the gross amount of such income from all separate sources accrued during the period from July 1, 1918, to and including June 30, 1919, and the deductions to which he may be entitled under this act, and the said taxes thereon, computed as provided in section 2, shall become due and collectible on or before September 1, 1919, and annually as hereinafter provided. If any person subject to said tax fails to make such return at the time herein fixed or makes a false return, the rent income tax administrator shall make the return from his own knowledge from such information as he can obtain, through testimony or otherwise, and the return so made shall be sufficient for all the purposes of this act. And to the amount of the tax due upon the returns so made by the rent income tax administrator there shall be added a penalty of 20 per cent of the tax, but when it shall appear that the failure to file the return or the making of a false return was due to an unavoidable or excusable cause the said penalty may be abated by the income tax administrator. It shall be the duty of the said rent income tax administrator to prepare and furnish to each taxpayer making application therefor printed forms upon which such returns shall be made. Said tax and all penalties thereon shall be payable to the collector of taxes for the District of Columbia on or before September 1, 1919, and annually thereafter so long as this act shall remain in force.

"Sec. 9. Every person who shall charge, collect, or receive rent of any real estate in the District of Columbia without having paid the tax herein provided for when the same shall be due shall, besides being liable for the payment of said tax, be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall pay a fine of not more than \$1,000.

"Sec. 10. That any person who shall contract for, collect, or receive a greater rent for any real estate than that fixed by order of the President or of the rent income tax administrator, or, in case of appeal, by the board of rent income tax appeals, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 for each offense; and this shall apply to sublessors and assignees of tenancies as well as to the original lessors.

"SEC. 11. This act shall remain in full force and effect for all purposes until one year after a treaty of peace between the Imperial German Government and the United States shall have been concluded: *Provided*, That, for the purpose of collecting taxes and penalties accrued before the conclusion of such peace, this act shall remain in force until the same are collected or enforced."

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order on the motion to recommit on the ground that it is not germane, and that it fixes a rent commission, which is foreign to the original bill. I do not know how familiar the Chair is with the original bill, but I will say for his information that in the original bill there is no provision for anyone to fix rents. I ask the Chair to distinguish between the provision in the original bill which authorizes the assessor of the District of Columbia to fix values upon real property, and that a tax is then fixed on those values, but there is nothing in the original bill which fixes rent.

In section 4 of the proposed substitute which the gentleman has just offered I find this language:

That it shall be the duty of the rent-income tax administrator on or before the 1st day of July, 1918, by specific order designating the real estate to be affected thereby, or by general order affecting groups or classes of pieces or parcels of real estate, to fix the amount of rent which it shall be lawful for the party to charge.

I say that is absolutely foreign to the bill. There is no provision in the original bill for fixing rents. There is a basis laid down upon which income taxes are to be charged, but nowhere in the bill is there anything said about fixing rents. That of itself, without going into the other parts of the motion, make it subject to the point of order.

I make the point, Mr. Speaker, that this provides for a commission, and again I ask that the Chair bear in mind that the original bill does not fix rents, and that the proposed amendment or substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts provides for a commission to fix rents when, to repeat again, nothing of that sort is in the original bill.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to be heard?

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I do. The bill offered by the honorable Representative from Kentucky seeks to fix rents in the District of Columbia and then to levy a tax upon all excesses. He attempts to do that in this way: That rents in the District of Columbia shall be fixed as of September 30, 1916, and 10 per cent advance, and that any excess of those rents shall be paid to the District treasury. That is the bare provision and principle of his bill. The provisions of my substitute merely differ from his bill in the following particular: I establish as he does a tax of 100 per cent of an excess over what may be fixed by a rent commissioner. I establish a rent commissioner who shall say what the rental shall be, and then anything in excess of what he fixes shall be paid at the same rate in the same manner and to the same place as in the bill of the honorable Representative from Kentucky. In other words, his bill is a tax measure upon its face and, he claims, in principle; and the bill which I offer is a tax measure on its face and in principle, but with a commissioner fixing the rental instead of the rental being fixed as of a certain date, a change merely in the machinery for obtaining the same result. Therefore, it is germane.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] desire to be heard?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up the time of the House, or even the time of the Speaker if he has resolved that this substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] is in order. I rise to make an argument that the motion to recommit as submitted is not subject to the point of order as advanced by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON]. I predicate that position upon the fact that the bill under consideration, the Johnson-Mapes bill, is a bill, according to its very title, to prevent extortion, and the whole scope of that bill provides the machinery by which extortion on the part of owners of real estate in the District can be checked. It not only provides the machinery in one way to control and check it by resorting to the taxing power and levying 100 per cent additional taxes on incomes above those received on or before a prior date, but it goes further and in section 5 provides a criminal penalty for any person to charge higher than the rate as fixed in his income-tax return. There are two ideas in the bill that carry out the idea of preventing extortion: First, levying a maximum amount of 100 per cent and confiscating all of the additional returns that have accrued from rentals since a certain date. Second, under section 5 it provides—

That all leases, contracts, and agreements, expressed or implied, providing for the payment of any large amount of money, or at a higher rate than that fixed by the deduction herein allowed, for the use or occupancy of any real estate are hereby declared to be contrary to public policy and unenforceable.

Now, what does the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts provide? There is no question whatsoever that it was within the authority of the House, and even now, to offer an amendment reducing the amount of tax that might be represented by these excess charges. That could be done, and there could be no question of the germaneness of such an amendment; that instead of levying 100 per cent, with a reduction of 10 per cent, as provided in the bill, there should be levied a tax of 75 per cent, which might be claimed was sufficient to deter these profiteers from exacting these excessive charges. But the gentleman from Massachusetts in his amendment provides another means of determining what should be the excess of charge. It does not say absolutely that it should be 75 per cent, 90 per cent, or 100 per cent, less 10 per cent, but it provides that there shall be a levy of 100 per cent on excesses of what represents a reasonable rental value, which will be determined by a board. Now, the subject matter of this matter before the House is to prevent exorbitant charges of rent—

Mr. COX. Rule!

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for that remark—to prevent extortionate charges of rent by the profiteers in the District. The gentleman from Kentucky provides one method; the gentleman from Massachusetts provides another. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully contend that this is quite on all fours with the decision of a former Speaker, when we had up for consideration the determination of a proposal to establish the Isthmian Canal. That precedent is found in section 5909 of Hinds' Precedents, volume 5:

To a bill providing for an interoceanic canal, specifying a certain route, an amendment providing for another route was held to be germane.

The main subject of that bill was the establishment of an interoceanic canal. The bill as introduced prescribed one route. It was held by the Speaker that the designation of another route was germane. So here in this matter before the House to-day, though the bill provides one method of levying the tax, the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts offers another method of determining the tax. Both are taxation measures, both with penalizing sections to check profiteering. I also direct the Chair's attention to a citation which is the foundation, I take it, of all the decisions of all Speakers on the question of germaneness, as found in Hinds' Precedents, section 5825, the noted decision of former Speaker Carlisle, where he lays down the fundamentals which should guide presiding officers in construing what should be germane and what should not be germane. He used this general language, which should be a guide for Speakers for all time in determining the question of germaneness:

When, therefore, it is objected that a proposed amendment is not in order because it is not germane, the meaning of the objection is simply that it (the proposed amendment) is a motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration. This is a test of admissibility prescribed by the express language of the rule; and if the Chair, upon an examination of the bill under consideration and the proposed amendment, shall be of the opinion that they do not relate to the same subject, he is bound to sustain the objection and exclude the objection, subject, of course, to the revisory power of the Committee of the Whole on appeal.

The question before the Speaker is whether the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is related, is akin to the subject as contained in the Johnson bill. Why, the Speaker will have to go pretty far in holding that it is not related, because the Tinkham bill is a taxation measure providing for 100 per cent of the income and the only difference is how this additional income is to be determined. The gentleman from Kentucky directs that the income shall be determined absolutely by taking the return as the standard. The gentleman from Massachusetts determines that the 100 per cent shall be determined by first ascertaining what is a reasonable rent for this property. I well remember the position that the Speaker took when he was a Member on the floor that this motion to recommit should not be prostituted by allowing some Member to rise and move a motion to recommit without instructions; that recognition should be given to some Member in opposition to a bill to move to recommit with directions, so as to give the House on a record vote an opportunity for them to express their judgment as to the respective questions in dispute.

True, the House can not be privileged to vote on something foreign and not related to the matter, but the House should always be privileged to have the opportunity to vote on something that is akin. Otherwise, if you adopt a different rule you make the committee that reports the bill the master of the actions of the House in determining what legislation should be enacted. This House may be inclined, and undoubtedly is, to stop this profiteering, but it may be opposed to the method of confiscation provided by the bill offered by the gentleman from

Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON]. But some opportunity should be given to provide for reaching these profiteers by a method akin to it, by saying the excess income over that previously charged above a reasonable rental and to be determined by a board, should be that which should be levied, rather than the arbitrary standard as fixed in the Johnson bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. In just one minute.

Mr. Fitzgerald, in a noted decision from the Speaker's chair, said that in order to determine the question of germaneness the question is whether it is related, whether it is akin, to the matter before the House. The question is whether the mere change in the machinery for determining what is a reasonable rent on which this income tax should be levied is not related to the standard as fixed in the Johnson bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will ask the gentleman if it is not true that on page 424 of Hinds' Precedents, volume 5, the Chair sustained the very point of order which the gentleman now refers to?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I have read and reread that decision and know the facts. What were the facts in that case?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It says the amendment was excluded. That is the language.

Mr. STAFFORD. Every decision of a Speaker on a question submitted to him must be determined according to the facts as presented for decision. What were the facts in that case? A deficiency appropriation bill was under consideration. It happened to contain an item making an appropriation for the support of the Government Printing Office, and if my memory serves me—I have not read the decision for more than a year—some person offered to establish the salary of the Public Printer on an item relating to the general maintenance of the Government Printing Office, and Speaker Carlisle naturally ruled that the question of the salary of the Public Printer was not related to the question providing for the maintenance of the Government Printing Office, which did not have anything to do with the question of the salaries of the employees.

I wish to make one further brief remark. The question is entirely different from the questions that were submitted in the Committee of the Whole. The bill as submitted there had no relation to the taxation feature at all.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is aware of that.

On the 8th of May, 1913, in the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, there was a battle royal in this House on a question very much like this one. It was on a motion to recommit the Underwood tariff bill. At the request of the Chair the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] furnished the Chair in advance of their motion to recommit, and it gave me ample time to investigate the matter. I did investigate it thoroughly and conscientiously. The question involved was whether they could hitch a tariff commission onto the bill. The proponents, Mr. MANN and Mr. PAYNE, upheld their side, as always, with a great deal of force and ability. The opposition was led by Mr. UNDERWOOD, who made the point of order against its germaneness. The opinion delivered covers three or four pages and was carefully prepared. I am not going to read it now, but I would advise all the Members of the House who take any interest in the parliamentary points to read it. The Chair sustained the point of order, because it was setting up a new kind of a machine that had nothing to do with the bill. Now, in this present case the Chair is not going to pass upon any of these points that are being raised and is not going to talk about them. There is one proposition in this motion to recommit that compels the Speaker in light of the precedents to hold this point of order well taken, and that is the bringing up of this administration feature, of the tax commission, a great machine, and all that.

The point of order is sustained. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky and Mr. MANN demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 101, answered "present" 6, not voting 99, as follows:

YEAS—222.

Alexander	Barkley	Brand	Caraway
Almon	Barnhart	Brodbeck	Carlisle
Anderson	Beakes	Browne	Carter, Okla.
Ashbrook	Beshlin	Burnett	Cary
Aswell	Bland	Butler	Church
Austin	Blanton	Byrnes, S. C.	Classon
Ayres	Borland	Byrns, Tenn.	Claypool
Baer	Bowers	Candler, Miss.	Collier

Connally, Tex.	Hadley	Lonergan	Shackleford
Connelly, Kans.	Hamilton, Mich.	Lundeen	Shallenberger
Cooper, W. Va.	Hamlin	Lunn	Sherley
Cooper, Wis.	Harrison, Miss.	Magee	Sherwood
Cox	Hastings	Mansfield	Shouse
Crosser	Haugen	Mapes	Sims
Dale, N. Y.	Hawley	Martin	Sinnott
Dale, Vt.	Hayden	Mays	Sloan
Davidson	Hellin	Miller, Wash.	Smith, Idaho
Decker	Helm	Moon	Smith, Mich.
Denton	Heilvering	Morgan	Smith, C. B.
Dewalt	Hensley	Neely	Smith, T. F.
Dickinson	Hillard	Nelson	Steagall
Dill	Holland	Nichols, S. C.	Stedman
Dillon	Houston	Nichols, Mich.	Steele
Dixon	Howard	Nolan	Stephens, Miss.
Dominick	Huddleston	Norton	Sterling, Pa.
Doolittle	Hull, Iowa	Oldfield	Stiness
Doremus	Hull, Tenn.	Oliver, Ala.	Summers
Dowell	Humphreys	Oliver, N. Y.	Sweet
Drane	Igoe	O'Shaunessy	Tague
Emerson	Ireland	Overmyer	Taylor, Ark.
Esch	Jacoway	Overstreet	Taylor, Colo.
Estopinal	Johnson, Ky.	Padgett	Thomas
Evans	Jones, Tex.	Park	Thompson
Farr	Kearns	Price	Tillman
Ferris	Keating	Purnell	Timberlake
Fields	Kelly, Pa.	Quin	Venable
Fisher	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey	Vestal
Flood	Kennedy, R. I.	Raker	Vinson
Fordney	Kettner	Ramseyer	Volgt
Foster	Key, Ohio	Rankin	Walton
Freeman	Kincheloe	Rayburn	Watkins
French	King	Reavis	Weaver
Fuller, Ill.	Kinkaid	Reed	Webb
Gallagher	Kitchin	Robbins	Welling
Gandy	Knutson	Roberts	Welty
Gard	La Follette	Robinson	Whaley
Garrett, Tenn.	Langley	Romjue	Wheeler
Garrett, Tex.	Larsen	Rouse	Wilson, Ill.
Godwin, N. C.	Lazaro	Rubey	Wingo
Good	Lea, Cal.	Rucker	Wood, Ind.
Goodwin, Ark.	Lesher	Russell	Woods, Iowa
Gordon	Lever	Sabath	Wright
Graham, Ill.	Linthicum	Sanders, La.	Young, N. Dak.
Gray, Ala.	Littlepage	Saunders, Va.	Young, Tex.
Greene, Vt.	Lobeck	Scott, Iowa	
Gregg	London	Sells	

NAYS—101.

Bacharach	Frear	Mason	Snell
Blackmon	Garner	Meeker	Snook
Britten	Gillett	Merritt	Stafford
Buchanan	Glynn	Montague	Steenerson
Burroughs	Gray, N. J.	Moore, Pa.	Sterling, Ill.
Caldwell	Green, Iowa	Moore, Ind.	Strong
Campbell, Kans.	Greene, Mass.	Mott	Swift
Cannon	Hardy	Mudd	Switzer
Carter, Mass.	Harrison, Va.	Olney	Temple
Chandler, N. Y.	Haskell	Osborne	Tilson
Chandler, Okla.	Hayes	Palge	Tinkham
Coady	Hersey	Parker, N. J.	Towner
Copley	Hicks	Peters	Vare
Dallinger	Hutchinson	Polk	Waldow
Darrow	Jones, Va.	Pou	Walsh
Dempsey	Juul	Powers	Ward
Denison	Kless, Pa.	Pratt	Wason
Dent	Lehlbach	Ramsey	Watson, Pa.
Dupré	Longworth	Rodenberg	White, Me.
Dyer	Lufkin	Rogers	Williams
Elliott	McArthur	Rose	Wilson, Tex.
Ellsworth	McKinley	Sanders, Ind.	Winslow
Elston	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sanders, N. Y.	Woodyard
Fairfield	McLemore	Sanford	
Focht	Madden	Siegel	
Francis	Mann	Slayden	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

Bankhead	Browning	Johnson, Wash.	Wise
Boohai	Glass		

NOT VOTING—99.

Anthony	Edmunds	Kraus	Rowe
Bell	Fairchild, B. L.	Kreider	Rowland
Black	Fairchild, G. W.	LaGuardia	Schall
Brumbaugh	Fess	Lee, Ga.	Scott, Mich.
Campbell, Pa.	Flynn	Lenroot	Scott, Pa.
Cantrill	Foss	Little	Scully
Capstick	Fuller, Mass.	McAndrews	Sears
Carew	Gallivan	McClintic	Sisson
Clark, Fla.	Garland	McCormick	Slemp
Clark, Pa.	Goodall	McCulloch	Small
Cooper, Ohio	Gould	McFadden	Snyder
Costello	Griest	McKenzie	Stephens, Nebr.
Crago	Hamilton, N. Y.	McKeown	Stevenson
Cramton	Heaton	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sullivan
Crisp	Heintz	Maher	Talbott
Currie, Mich.	Hollingsworth	Miller, Minn.	Templeton
Curry, Cal.	Hood	Mondell	Treadway
Davis	Husted	Morin	Van Dyke
Dies	James	Parker, N. Y.	Volstead
Dooling	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Walker
Doughton	Kahn	Platt	Watson, Va.
Drukker	Kehoe	Porter	White, Ohio
Dunn	Kelley, Mich.	Ragsdale	Wilson, La.
Eagan		Randall	Zihlman
Eagle		Riordan	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. SISSON (for) with Mr. PARKER of New York (against).

Mr. BOOHER (for) with Mr. TREADWAY (against).

Mr. CANTRILL (for) with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania (against).

Mr. HAMILL (for) with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD (against).
 Mr. BELL (for) with Mr. GOULD (against).
 Until further notice:
 Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. CURRY of California.
 Mr. STEVENSON with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.
 Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. BROWNING.
 Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. KEHOE with Mr. ZIHLMAN.
 Mr. WATSON of Virginia with Mr. DUNN.
 Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania with Mr. JAMES.
 Mr. SEARS with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. LITTLE.
 Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. FOSS.
 Mr. HOOD with Mr. VOLSTEAD.
 Mr. CRISP with Mr. FESS.
 Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. ANTHONY.
 Mr. BLACK with Mr. COSTELLO.
 Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. EDMONDS.
 Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina with Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. GARLAND.
 Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. GOODALL.
 Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania with Mr. HEATON.
 Mr. DIES with Mr. CRAIG.
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. GRIEST.
 Mr. EAGLE with Mr. CRAMTON.
 Mr. EAGAN with Mr. DAVIS.
 Mr. FLYNN with Mr. HUSTED.
 Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. KAHN.
 Mr. McKEOWN with Mr. PLATT.
 Mr. McANDREWS with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.
 Mr. PHELAN with Mr. ROWE.
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. McCULLOCH.
 Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. McFADDEN.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. PORTER.
 Mr. RANDALL with Mr. MCKENZIE.
 Mr. SCHALL with Mr. TEMPLETON.
 Mr. SMALL with Mr. ROWLAND.
 Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan.
 Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. SCOTT of Michigan.
 Mr. WALKER with Mr. SLEMP.
 Mr. WHITE of Ohio with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.
 Mr. WILSON of Louisiana with Mr. DRUKKER.
 Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no." I have a pair with my colleague, Mr. TALBOTT, and I want to withdraw my vote and be recorded as "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.
 The Clerk called the name of Mr. BROWNING, and he answered "Present."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye." I have a pair with Mr. JAMES, of Michigan, who, if he were here, would vote the same way. I wish my vote to stand.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I understand my name was called on the second roll call. I voted "aye" on the first roll call. I desire to have the RECORD corrected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.
 The Clerk called the name of Mr. ALEXANDER, and he voted in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. KEHOE, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for two days, on account of important business.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING BILL.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent that what is known as the Senate daylight-saving bill be given a privileged status.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I object.
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill which has just been passed. I wish to do so for the purpose of criticizing the bill introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] on that subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the bill just passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.
 Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.
 The SPEAKER. As to what?

Mr. KEARNS. To extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire if the gentleman from Ohio desires to extend his remarks on the bill just passed?

Mr. KEARNS. That is what I asked.
 The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio, that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD, the remarks to be confined to the bill just passed as nearly as he can?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

On March 8, 1918:

H. R. 6361. An act to extend protection to the civil rights of members of the Military and Naval Establishments of the United States engaged in the present war.

On March 11, 1918:

S. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution providing additional time for the payment of purchase money under homestead entries within the former Colville Indian Reservation, Wash.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10358, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10358, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10358, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10358) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending matter is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] to strike out a certain paragraph of the bill. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, before I proceed could I ask the Chair to have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment indicated.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUCKER: Page 105: strike out the paragraph beginning on line 5 and ending on line 17, which reads as follows: "Appointment shall not be made to any of the positions herein appropriated for in the classified service of the Bureau of Pensions not actually filled June 30, 1918, nor shall more than 25 per cent of other vacancies actually occurring in any grade in the classified service of that bureau, during the fiscal year 1919, be filled by original appointment or promotion. The salaries or compensation of all places which may not be filled as hereinabove provided for shall not be available for expenditure but shall lapse and shall be covered into the Treasury. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to any position with a salary of \$2,250 or above than sum."

Mr. RUCKER. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the committee I will be very glad to explain as best I can the significance of this paragraph in the bill, and the reasons which I think justify the motion to strike it out.

The Bureau of Pensions is not a new creation. It has been in the service of the Government a long time, for many years. It is a fact well known to gentlemen on both sides of the aisle that many of the employees in the Pension Bureau are veterans of the Civil War. Necessarily that class of employees in the service of the Pension Bureau are aged men. In this connection let me say that in response to a question propounded to the Deputy Commissioner of Pensions by the chairman having this bill in charge as to the average age of the employees in the Pension Bureau, the Deputy Commissioner stated that a careful examination recently made showed that the average age of all the employees in the service of that bureau is 57 years. Even the chairman and his associate who sits on the other side of the aisle evidently were somewhat astounded at the information, because—immediately the inquiry was made—I do not know that I quote the question verbatim, but I do in substance:

"That does not include the messenger boys, does it?" The answer was, "Yes; it includes them all." When you consider and include messenger boys in that service, which, of course, reduces the general average of the age—because they are quite young men—the average age of those who are to-day performing service in that bureau is 57 years. They run from among the youngest men in the Government service to the very eldest. There are men there past 80 years of age, a number of them. And so it happens, and it happens without a complaint or protest of any mortal man who is patriotic, generally speaking, these old men, these old veterans, hold the highest-paid positions. The committee having in charge the preparation of this bill, which is brought in and passed by the House and by Congress annually, has for three or four years, without any sort of bad feeling, without any personality, but persuaded by an erroneous, and I think a faulty judgment, has been whittling away at the organization of the Pension Office.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will my colleague yield right there?

Mr. RUCKER. I do.

Mr. HAMLIN. Is any provision similar to this carried in the bill against any other bureau?

Mr. RUCKER. I am glad the gentleman asked me that, because I do not want to forget it. I will reply in a moment.

I repeat, if there be an error in the policy of the committee, I will assume that it is merely an error of judgment, and I want if I can to appeal to the judgment of each member of this committee to help correct the error. The Committee on Appropriations is the servant of the House and not its master. If I, as your servant, should err in my judgment, would you blindly follow my lead after you have considered the facts and discovered my error? Or will you say to your public servant: "You must respond to the will of the House whose servant you are!" Any other course produces right here under the dome of the Capitol of the Nation a condition against which men are to-day pledging their lives, an autocracy that can not be tolerated.

My colleague from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] asks if there is any provision similar to the one which was read from the Clerk's desk a moment ago, which the pending amendment seeks to strike out, with reference to any other bureau in the public service, and in the presence of the chairman of the committee that framed the bill I answer no; there is not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to proceed for 10 minutes. I do not think I will ask any more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER. There are many bureaus in the departments of the Government here, some in their infancy. There are bureaus all over the town, in all the different departments, and they are multiplying and growing like mushrooms. New ones are being organized practically every day; but you can search the records of congressional proceedings until you tire and you will not find, with reference to a single other bureau, an effort to place shackles upon Government agencies like those which gentlemen would bind around and upon the employees and those in charge of the Pension Bureau. I ask the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill not to forget to answer in his own time to the membership of this House why a distinct, positive, unmistakable discrimination is made against the officials and clerical force of the Pension Bureau. I would not appeal to partisan spirit and I would not suggest that, because gentlemen high in authority on the Committee on Appropriations come from States in a certain section of this Nation, that such fact has anything to do with the question, because on the other side are gentlemen who come from other sections who are in harmony with the action of the committee. But I ask gentlemen on either side of the aisle to give the House some reason why this particular bureau should be discriminated against in this way? May I say that it seems to me this discrimination is so bad and so pronounced as to cast a reflection upon distinguished and honorable men charged with the administration of the affairs of that bureau? Do gentlemen say they have been prodigal? Have they been neglectful? Have they been inefficient? Have they done anything to merit this kind of unfriendly and offensive treatment at the hands of Congress? But gentlemen say the work is getting less, that the old soldiers are dying, and that is a lamentable truth which we all know. They are dying, and dying fast. But, in the providence of God, they are leaving good widows, many of them; they are leaving children; and, notwithstanding the large death rate which annually decimates the ranks of these old men who a few years

ago wore the blue so proudly and so bravely in defense of this great Nation of ours, the truth is that, notwithstanding the columns of these old veterans are broken by the invasion of the angel of death, and that many of them annually respond to the last roll call, there are substantially as many names on the pension roll now, I think, as there were a year ago—not of soldiers, perhaps, but of widows of soldiers and the children of soldiers.

And again I will say that this Congress, whether rightfully or wrongfully, a year or so ago enacted what is called the Ashbrook law, which has brought to the Pension Office more than 175,000 extra applications for pensions to be disposed of by that bureau.

Then, there is the bill with reference to the Spanish-American War soldiers, which entailed very much additional work on the bureau. That is recent legislation. There is legislation on the calendar now, which I think I am warranted in saying will become a law, which is going to add still further to the work of the bureau.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will it interrupt the gentleman if I ask him a question?

Mr. RUCKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. LANGLEY. Is it not a fact that the correspondence of the bureau is further behind now than it has been in recent years? Is not that the gentleman's experience? It is mine. I know they are behind with their correspondence. I have had numerous instances of it lately.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, a direct answer to that question may be at variance with the experience of Members of the House who do any considerable amount of pension work, for the reason that I am privately informed by the Deputy Commissioner of Pensions that the work is practically current, so far as correspondence with Members of Congress is concerned. He makes a special effort to keep up with congressional correspondence, but the thousands of cases which come direct to the Pension Bureau have caused them to get behind in their work. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] is right.

Mr. LANGLEY. I want to say that I have cases in mind now, dozens of them, where answers to letters which I have written to the bureau have not been received for three weeks after the inquiry was submitted, and the explanation has been made to me that they were behind with their correspondence. I am not criticizing the bureau, which, I think, is doing the best it can with the force at its command. I am merely combating the argument that they are up with their work. I know it is not so.

Mr. RUCKER. I am glad to have the gentleman say that, because I know the fact is that there has been a world of increase in their work there.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Would the fact of the bureau being up to date with its correspondence be any indication of there being no necessity for more help?

Mr. RUCKER. I will say to the gentleman frankly that that would be one way by which we would determine the adequacy of the help, but not necessarily conclusive.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. The suggestion I want to bring home to the gentleman and the House is the fact that you might get a prompt reply, but the party about whom you were writing might have to wait months and months.

Mr. RUCKER. There is no question about that.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. They have to wait months for the aid that this bureau should give practically at a moment's notice.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the gentleman emphasizes that thought.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman permit me something not in the form of a question? If there is anything in the world, or any bureau in the world, where there should be a sufficient clerical and field force to respond to the needs and necessities of the American people, it is the Bureau of Pensions. There should be no delay. Once a claim is submitted, there should be an expeditious handling of the claim, and I do not believe in stinting it under any circumstances.

Mr. RUCKER. I am obliged to the gentleman from Rhode Island for his statement. Let me say to the committee—and I know that I am looking into the faces of gentlemen who have had similar experiences—that time and again I have put forth my efforts to bring relief to some suffering old man, or suffering old widow of a soldier, to hasten action on a pension claim as much as I could with conditions existing as they do at the Pension Office, and yet before the Government could extend to the man the little bounty it had pledged to him and scatter a little sunshine, hope, and joy into his life, that soldier or widow, as the case may have been, has been summoned from this world. There are many cases of that sort. Men die wait-

ing for action because some men in the country say that we do not need any more force in the Pension Bureau, because the old soldiers are fast dying. I confess that I become a little excited when I hear men speaking of those things unfeelingly, I think.

Let me tell you what this bill proposes. It proposes, as I said, a distinct discrimination. In all the numerous, countless bureaus of this Government there is no provision like this. Listen to this: Mark you, in this very bill you cut out about 100 employees in the Pension Office. Is that not true, I ask the chairman of the committee?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Forty-three.

Mr. RUCKER. Only 43; I thought it was more than that. Notwithstanding that and notwithstanding it will be said to you to-day that those who fought during the War of the Rebellion are dying rapidly, and that must be confessed and admitted to be true, yet the committee in this bill says:

Appointment shall not be made to any of the positions herein appropriated for in the classified service of the Bureau of Pensions not actually filled June 30, 1918.

In the corresponding bill which was enacted last year similar language was carried; so if there were three vacancies in a certain class, or in many classes, not actually filled—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER (continuing)—

Nor shall more than 25 per cent of other vacancies actually occurring in any grade in the classified service of that bureau, during the fiscal year 1919, be filled by original appointment or promotion.

Do gentlemen comprehend what that means? Here are a number of classes, class 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, and in some of the classes quite a number of people are necessarily employed in order to do the work that the Government ought to and must do. This committee exercises an iron control, almost a despotic power, in curtailing the number of clerks in every class in the Pension Bureau when they think more clerks are employed than are needed, and only appropriate for those which they—the committee—finds are needed. If in this bill they appropriate for 75 clerks of a certain class it is because this committee realizes that that number of clerks are needed. Then, mark you, what follows? I will assume that there are 75 clerks in class 1, for argument. This bill provides that not more than 25 per cent of the vacancies actually occurring in any grade during the fiscal year shall be filled by promotion or by original appointments.

Here these gentlemen solemnly determine that the bureau needs 75 clerks for the ensuing year, and appropriate for them, but during the year 3 clerks may die, and hence there would be three vacancies. You ask why not fill them? The answer is because these gentlemen, the Committee on Appropriations, say that you shall not fill them. They say you can only fill 25 per cent of the places, and therefore it requires four vacancies in order to secure one appointment. If three men die in class 1 and class 2 and class 3 and class 4, thus creating twelve vacancies, in each of which the Committee on Appropriations says a clerk is needed, yet the vacancies can not be filled either by promotion or original appointment, because there were only three to die in each class, and the Appropriations Committee has decreed that there must exist four vacancies in each class before one place can be filled either by promotion or appointment.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. In the event that there are only three employees in class 1, what provision is made for filling that vacancy if it requires four?

Mr. RUCKER. The Committee on Appropriations is a progressive committee, and it has made some progress. They had that sort of a proposition in the bill the year before or two years ago, but this limitation has been liberalized some little since then.

I speak candidly, and I say that this committee, after much deliberation, solemnly came into this House last year, if I am not mistaken as to the date, with a provision which in the event of death or catastrophe having removed all of the medical examiners, that would have left the bureau without a single medical examiner, because the bill declared that there should be no filling of any place unless four vacancies should exist. See how peculiar it is. If gentlemen say we need four clerks in a given class, why require all four to die, and then only allow the promotion or appointment of one to take the place of

four. If such a policy must exist in this country, I insist that it should, as a matter of fairness and right, be a universal policy, because one of the principles that I learned early in life was that there should be no special favoritism shown in these matters and no unjust discrimination against men who are honestly and courageously performing official duties.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes; I gladly yield.

Mr. HAMLIN. Awhile ago something was said about the work being current. I took occasion yesterday to read the testimony in regard to this matter, and I remember very well that the Deputy Commissioner said it was practically current so far as the correspondence went in collecting the testimony, but they did not have the force to make it anything like current in adjudicating the cases after they came in, which is the principal and main thing. He also testified there were a good many vacancies incurred by transfers from his bureau to other bureaus in the Government where they paid better salaries than they could afford to pay there. Then, under the provision the gentleman is discussing, they can not fill those unless there are three.

Mr. RUCKER. Certainly not.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. The bill provides that four men in the Pension Office resign from it before they can put in one in the service. I yield to the gentleman who has arisen.

Mr. GOOD. It is a fact that no clerk can secure a transfer without the consent of the chief of the bureau in which he is employed, so if transfers are being made they are made with the consent of the Commissioner of Pensions, and he certainly would not consent to them if he is in such dire straits as the gentleman stated.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa is correct, but why should the officials refuse transfers when you say here that if three men die in a class during this fiscal year the vacancies shall not be filled either by appointment or promotion. If some of those men who are doomed to go from that bureau by virtue of this odious limitation, who have been working so faithfully all these years, because you have refused to appropriate for them, and the chairman says this bill fails to appropriate for 43 clerks who were provided for in the bill passed last year—if those unfortunate clerks over whose heads the ax is swinging, soon to be dropped with disastrous consequences to them, can find a place in some other bureau, why not let them be transferred to some other service?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I would like to say to the gentleman that about 18 months ago I filed quite a number of widows' claims in the Bureau of Pensions. Shortly after the applications were filed I filed all the necessary evidence in order to prosecute the claims. Several months elapsed, and I wrote the commissioner asking him why the claims had not been allowed. I was advised after 18 months had elapsed there were still 48,000 claims pending in the Bureau of Pensions, and that these claims were taken up in the order in which they were filed, and it was not possible to grant these pensions until they were reached in the regular order.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Does it seem like the proper thing to do, like the wise thing to do, if these old widows, some of them 85 years old, are compelled to wait for 18 months to 2 years to have their claims adjudicated, when all of the necessary evidence has been furnished—is it proper and wise for this committee to decrease the force further or to increase it?

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, the gentleman's question answers itself. Unless we intend to slap that bureau in the face, we ought to give them adequate force. No one will deny that.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It has been reported—I have heard it several times, and I want to ask the gentleman if he has made any investigation in respect to it—that there is a studied attempt being made for the purpose of discrediting the Pension Bureau on account of the new War-Risk Bureau, and for the purpose of boosting the new War-Risk Bureau so that it will eventually take over the pension end of this Government?

Mr. RUCKER. I will say to the gentleman that I have heard such rumors, but really I can not think they are true. I still insist, hard though it is for me to do so, that this is simply a matter of bad judgment on the part of this committee. I do not think the committee can be actuated by a desire to turn the Pension Bureau, with its corps of well-trained and efficient clerks, over to the War-Risk Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, let me remind gentlemen that civil-service law is in force in this land. The present administration favors it and past administrations favored it. Gentlemen who are on this committee, and I think every one of them, stand sponsors for civil service, but when it comes to the Pension Bureau they contradict their every act in official life and insist that as to this one bureau clerks and employees engaged there shall not enjoy the rights, emoluments, and benefits of civil service. If there is anything in civil service to justify any sane man in voting for it or standing for it, it is that idea of equality and reward for merit, that idea that you or I or any man in the land, though inexperienced, may, by faithful effort, by loyal and patriotic endeavor, by assiduous care and devotion to the work intrusted to us shall in recognition of valuable services be moved up a step to a more responsible place, with possibly a little pittance more of compensation, when vacancies occur for which we are eligible and qualified.

The very soul of civil-service law is the hope that encourages one to confidently believe that if he continues to prove his fidelity to his country, his loyalty to his Government, and his fidelity to duty, that when a vacancy higher up occurs those in authority will say to him, step up higher; we will reward the patriotic, diligent, and untiring efforts of a faithful and worthy clerk. But in the Pension Bureau see, oh, see, how dark and dismal is the future to one of these civil-service employees of that office. There is no hope—no chance for promotion. No. Why? Because this group of distinguished men—the Committee on Appropriations—selected by us to serve us, have determined that, however faithful the service of any man in that bureau, there shall be no reward for his fidelity, there is no hope of his promotion, but he must be doomed to sit at the desk where he started in life with every avenue of advancement closed to him.

Gentlemen, is it possible that the representatives of a great Nation will, without reason or excuse for the act, after they have had their attention called to it, deal so harshly and cruelly with men intrusted with the performance of official duties and who always have been true and loyal to their obligations? I hope you will wipe out this section by unanimous vote. Give the boy in the Pension Bureau an even opportunity in life; give him a chance if he is worthy of it, if he is loyal, if he is sober, if he is faithful, if he performs his duty well, give him the same chance to be promoted that every other clerk in every other department of this Government enjoys.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Do not we owe more to the soldiers and their widows in expediting the adjudicating of their claims?

Mr. RUCKER. I am trying, if I can, to avoid a discussion of that thought, because I am afraid there may be those somewhere to whom such an appeal would be fruitless. I believe if gentlemen who are in my presence to-day could go and see what I have seen, if they could visit the humble home of some man who bled and almost died for that flag, if they could see how dark and dismal with despair are many of the humble abodes of good, brave, and true men, and hear the shrieks of agony that come from widows, emaciated and broken by the burdens of life, their helpless children whose father's proudest boast was that he was a faithful, brave Federal soldier, they would join with me in calling on this committee to take out of the bill that which I think does injustice to the sense of fairness of this House, and which I think stigmatizes the Pension Bureau, and which I think ought to be repudiated by every fair-minded man.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] closed with a very eloquent appeal in behalf of his amendment to strike out this paragraph, but I think I can show to the committee that there is nothing in this provision which is recommended by the committee and nothing in the status of the work now in the Pension Office which justifies the appeal just made. Now, the gentleman speaks of this proposition as if it were a new one. As a matter of fact, this provision of law was first carried in an appropriation bill five years ago, and every year, without exception, the gentleman from Missouri has made a motion to strike it out, and has delivered an appeal such as he made here to-day, and the House has consistently refused to adopt his motion. Now, if you will pardon me for a moment, I want to state to you the reason which influenced the committee originally in placing this provision in the law. The committee found five years ago

that there was an extraordinary number of clerks in the Pension Office. The committee felt that in the interest of economy, efficiency, and better administration something should be done to reduce the force in the Pension Office. Now, no one of the committee was willing to turn out any civil-service employee of the Pension Office, whether old or young. We were not willing to do an injustice to any employee of the Pension Office by eliminating the position that he held, because I want to say to you that we have no disposition whatever to deny the Pension Office a single clerk that is necessary to do the work of that office. On the contrary, we want the Pension Office to have all the force that is necessary to dispose of claims in that office at the earliest possible moment, and that is the desire of every member of the committee, coming as they do from every section of this country. But, as I say, confronted as we were with the patent proposition that there were too many clerks in the Pension Office, feeling that something should be done to reduce them, and at the same time not desiring to work any injury upon any particular individual employed in that office, the committee finally decided to adopt the provision which was, I am told, recommended by a former Commissioner of Pensions, Mr. Warner, I think it was, many years ago, and carried in the bill at that time. So it was provided that in the succeeding fiscal year not more than 25 per cent of the vacancies occurring in the Pension Office should be filled by appointment.

In that way the committee felt that we could reduce the force in the office and at the same time do no injury to any employee in the office. That provision was carried in the bill for one or two years. Now, what happened? We felt, gentlemen of the committee, I want to say in all frankness, that the House and the committee were not shown the spirit of cooperation that was expected. If a \$1,800 clerk died or resigned, causing a vacancy, we immediately found in the next hearing that promotions were made from the lower to the \$1,800 grade without regard to the number in the respective grades. The result was that in a couple of years we found that the Pension Office was top heavy in the higher salaries, containing a much higher percentage of clerks getting those large salaries than any other bureau of any other department in the Government. And to prove that—

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER. How does the average salary of the Pension Office compare with the average salary of the War-Risk Bureau, say, or any other bureau of the Government?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have those figures. I am glad the gentleman referred to them, because I intend to present them to the House.

Mr. RUCKER. If the gentleman will allow me to interrupt him—I hope not to do so again—I understood the gentleman to say awhile ago that you have reduced the number of clerks about 47 this year.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Forty-three employees in this bill.

Mr. RUCKER. But in your report accompanying this bill, as I read it, it says the number of persons employed in the Pension Office in 1918—that is, for this fiscal year—was 1,091, and the number provided for in this bill is 962, making a difference of 129.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Some of the vacancies have occurred by transfer, but, as a matter of fact, this bill only seeks to omit 43 positions. I can show the gentleman the statement.

Mr. RUCKER. That is, 43 that were carried in the last bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. You drop out a whole lot this year.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, again, I just made the remark that the result of that provision—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for 10 minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The result was that we had a top-heavy force there in the Pension Office. We found a great big percentage of the clerks drawing \$1,800 and \$1,600 and \$1,400, and a correspondingly small percentage of clerks drawing \$1,100, \$1,000, and \$900.

Now, what could we do? As I say, without intending the least reflection on those in charge of the Pension Bureau, because I have the highest regard and esteem for them as capable, honest, and efficient Government officials, we felt that they had not altogether enforced the provision of law in the true spirit of its meaning and intention. But I want to say in justice to them that I do not think it was altogether their fault, because when an \$1,800 vacancy occurred I have no doubt but that

many Members of Congress rushed down to them and insisted that they should promote some \$1,600, \$1,400, or \$1,200 clerk, and we felt that in adopting this provision we were really relieving those gentlemen of the burden of resisting the importunities of Members of Congress who were bringing influence to bear in securing promotions for constituents of theirs in the Pension Bureau. So we adopted another provision that provided that not more than 25 per cent of the vacancies occurring in any one grade should be filled. And that is the way in which this provision was written into law.

Now, as bearing out what I said to you, and in response to the question of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], let me tell you that there are now in the Pension Office a percentage of 6.1 drawing \$2,000 and more; 11.7 per cent drawing \$1,800; 8.9 per cent drawing \$1,600; 25 per cent drawing \$1,400; 33.2 per cent drawing \$1,200; 6.5 per cent, \$1,000; 3.7 per cent, \$900; 2.3 per cent, \$840; six-tenths of 1 per cent, \$720; one-tenth of 1 per cent, \$660; and six-tenths of 1 per cent, \$420, and out of a total force of 962. In other words, at the present moment, gentlemen, there are \$5.5—now, listen to this—\$5.5 per cent of the entire force of the Pension Bureau getting \$1,200 or more and only 13.8 per cent getting less than \$1,200.

Now, let us compare that with the War-Risk Bureau, with a force of 1,844 persons. Only 17.6 per cent of the employees of the War-Risk Bureau get \$1,200 and over, as compared with 85.5 per cent of the Pension Bureau; 79.2 per cent of the War-Risk Bureau get less than \$1,200, as compared with 13.8 per cent in the Pension Office. Or, in other words, the average salary of the employees in the War-Risk Bureau to-day, gentlemen, is only \$1,063 per annum, while the average salary of the 962 employees in the Pension Office is \$1,374 per annum.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I wish you gentlemen would let me get through, and I will be glad to yield.

Mr. LANGLEY. I wanted to ask a question pertinent at this point.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield to the gentleman in a few moments. I want to refer for a moment to the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] to the effect that the action of the committee was resulting in interfering with the efficient administration of the work in the bureau.

Now, I have a letter which was sent to me after the hearings were printed by the Assistant Pension Commissioner on January 10. He inclosed a letter addressed by the chief clerk of the Pension Bureau to the Pension Commissioner, and I shall read a portion of that letter to you and let you see from the statements of the chief clerk whether or not the action of the committee in the past has resulted in depriving the office of the necessary number of clerks to perform the work efficiently and promptly. What does he say? Listen:

Recent legislation has thrown considerable new and important work upon this bureau. By reason of deaths, transfers, resignations, and employees entering military service the force now engaged on the adjudication of pension claims is about 100 fewer than this time last year.

And you will observe that the decrease in force comes from the resignations of clerks to go into the military service and with other objects in view. He says further:

Notwithstanding this increase of work and decrease in help, the bureau has, by the adoption of new and simplified methods, the proper distribution of the clerks, the hearty cooperation of officials and employees, and the cutting of red tape, managed to expedite and handle with the proper care this additional work and at the same time keep current the regular work of the bureau.

[Applause.]

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, gentlemen, there is no denying that statement made by the chief clerk of the Pension Bureau, and he has done that, remember, with a hundred less employees than he had at this time last year.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I would like to ask the gentleman the date of the letter.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is December 31. It was sent to me on January 10.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Right along that line, let me ask the gentleman how he accounts for the fact that the bureau now, right at this time, is 12 months to 2 years behind in its work? If they are able to carry the current work up, how does he explain the proposition?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I explain that by saying, with all due deference to the gentleman, that in that statement he takes issue with the chief clerk of the Pension Bureau and also with the hearings which were taken before the committee.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Let me say to the gentleman that last week I had occasion to call at the Bureau of Pensions. More than 18 months ago I filed a claim for an old Civil War widow. I filed all the evidence in the case shortly, within 60 days after the time the claim was filed. The old lady is past 85 years of

age. If I have written one letter to the Bureau of Pensions, I have written a dozen.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Do not take all my time.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I would like to finish this statement. I have written to the bureau asking why this claim has not been adjudicated, inasmuch as all the evidence had been filed.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is, I think, easily explained. Mr. KEY of Ohio. He explained to me that he had not had the force.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The assistant commissioner stated to the committee that there were approximately 55,000 pensioners removed from the rolls during the last year, and that they had received 117,000 new applications. He further stated that under the Ashbrook law, which raised the pensions of widows, there were 175,000 applications for increase filed.

That law, as you know, was passed in September, 1916, less than two years ago. Yet the Assistant Pension Commissioner stated that, notwithstanding the fact that he had no increased force, they had disposed of 165,000 of those 175,000 applications. He said that on account of raising the limit of marriage from 1890 to 1905 there had been 48,000 cases filed, and there were 16,000 filed by reason of the change of law as to marriage; 9,000 cases were filed on account of the law giving pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars, and 40,000 claims in other classes.

Now, he did say that in the work on claims in which evidence has been presented the office would be current by the 1st of June or July. You gentlemen know how difficult it is to get the necessary evidence. Sometimes the claims have to be sent back to the field and to the pension examiners time and time again before the proof is fully established so that it can be passed upon. I have had the same experience myself. I have had claims which have been sent to one State and then to another State to pension examiners for the purpose of securing evidence.

Now, when the gentleman says that those claims are behind, he states what is necessarily true.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I have no objection to the present chief clerk of the bureau bragging on his own administration of his office. He is a personal friend of mine, and I desire to commend him for his faithful and efficient service. But I do know that the bureau is not up to date with its work, and I can pick out a dozen cases from memory right now where—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, the gentleman may pick out a dozen cases or he may pick out a hundred cases from his district, because he has a great many from his district—

Mr. LANGLEY. That is true—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But I submit to him that in cases where there has been a considerable delay it has been because the applicants have not furnished the necessary proof in the first instance to secure action on the claims. The cases have to be sent sometimes to different pension examiners before the Pension Commissioner can act in one way or another upon them.

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; but that argument does not apply to the case referred to by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEY] and many others that I know of of a similar character, where the applications and the evidence were filed and months and months elapsed before any action, or where the applications have been filed and months pass by before they call for evidence in the cases. I am not criticizing the bureau; I am merely stating facts that are within my personal knowledge.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. If you will turn to page 567 of the hearings you will find that the assistant commissioner testified that all work would be current by the 1st of June or July. We are not making provision here that will become effective before that date, so that before this money is available all the work, according to the Assistant Commissioner of Pensions, will be current, and they will start off with that work current; and this force is to be 100 men more than they now have to do the work next year.

Mr. RUCKER. One hundred less.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I wish to repeat, gentlemen, that the committee is not actuated by any other purpose save that of bringing about or continuing the efficient and proper administration of the Pension Bureau and at the same time eliminating any clerks that may not be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. You gentlemen know that under the law which was passed last fall every application for pension to-day by a soldier who was in the Army after October 6 goes not to the Pension Office, but to the War-Risk Bureau. The Pension Office does not consider applications for pensions—

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have not the time. They do not consider applications for pension on the part of the soldiers who are in the Army to-day. They go to the War-Risk Bureau. Now why, under those circumstances, should we undertake to adopt this provision and permit this bureau to again unduly increase their force if they see fit to do it?

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And not only increase it, but, as they did in the past, build up a great, big, top-heavy bureau of high-salaried clerks in comparison with other bureaus in this Government, because I say to you, without fear of successful contradiction, that there is not a bureau in any department of the Government that has nearly so large a percentage of high salaries as are now being paid in this particular bureau, and it is for that very reason that the committee adopted this provision, and it is for that reason that I ask you to sustain the committee in this matter by voting down this amendment.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman speaks of the bureau being top-heavy. It could not put in more men of one class than the committee appropriates for, could it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman know this, that to-day, when he talks about there being such a great necessity for clerks, it developed in the hearings that they had a \$1,600 and \$1,800 position that had been vacant for a time?

Mr. RUCKER. They could not fill it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I beg your pardon. They could have done so.

Mr. RUCKER. Let me ask you a question.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will read to you what Mr. Tieman said about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Tennessee offered to answer questions.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman may have two minutes more.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may be able to direct the gentleman's attention to what he wishes to quote. The gentleman will find it on page 559 of the hearings.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman read it?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes. I read:

Mr. BYRNS. Take the 34 vacancies which have occurred since July 1, and give us those grades.

Mr. TIEMAN. One medical examiner, \$1,800; one chief of division, \$2,000; three principal examiners, \$2,000—

Now, mark you—

four clerks of class 4, \$1,800—

Those were vacancies existing at present, where under the existing provision he could appoint one. Then—

four clerks of class 3, \$1,600—

Where he could appoint a clerk whom he had not appointed and where we have reason to assume he does not need that clerk—

seven clerks of class 2—

And yet no appointment to that vacancy, although he is entitled under this provision to make an appointment—

five clerks of class 1, \$1,200—

But no appointment has been made under existing law. There is the proof that he has an adequate force.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? That indicates that the Pension Bureau has not been prodigal, but exceedingly careful about filling places where they are not needed.

Mr. STAFFORD. It indicates that they have ample force down there, and we followed that in fixing the number of clerks in the respective grades, basing our action upon this information, so that in the next fiscal year the bureau will not be hampered in any way whatsoever.

Mr. RUCKER. It means that they are not advancing clerks in the bureau where they do not need them, does it not?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; it means that they are not employing clerks in the respective grades where they can employ them.

Mr. RUCKER. It does not mean anything of the kind. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] another question, if he will permit me. Will the gentleman be kind enough to read the following paragraph of that letter which he received from the chief clerk down there?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman mean with reference to the 60,000 applications?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes. The paragraph which shows that there are 60,000 unadjudicated claims in the bureau right now.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is stated in the hearings.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman has not read it. Will he kindly read that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The paragraph to which the gentleman refers reads as follows:

There are now approximately 60,000 active pending claims in the bureau. There are also over 350,000 invalid pensioners now on the roll. These pensioners are dying at the rate of about 30,000 per annum. It is estimated that the death of 30,000 invalid pensioners occasions the filing of approximately 20,000 new claims—widows', minor children's, dependents', and reimbursement claims—and that the death of a certain number of widow pensioners will cause the filing of claims amounting to about one-fifth of that number, which would be, according to the number of widows dying each year, about 5,000 claims.

Now, that is practically the only source from which this Pension Bureau will get its additional claims unless new legislation is passed, because, as I just stated, under the law as it reads to-day, all claims for pensions on the part of soldiers in the Army after October 6 go to the War-Risk Bureau.

Mr. RUCKER. But the gentleman knows there have been a whole lot of applications caused by deaths and injuries before October 6.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Why should we undertake to maintain this force at its present size, when the work must necessarily grow less?

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Until my time expires.

Mr. MAPES. I have heard it stated that it was the policy of the bureau to delay the granting of the applications of widows on the theory that they are dying off rapidly, and that if the bureau delays the granting of their pensions a year or so it will not be necessary to give a great many of them a pension at all. What does the gentleman know about that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not believe that there is any truth in that sort of a statement.

Mr. MAPES. I hope there is not.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I certainly hope there is not, and my knowledge of the gentleman in charge of the Pension Bureau is such as to make me say that I am satisfied that there is no justification for that sort of a statement.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I had four cases this last year of persons who required the coming of a special examiner to examine their cases, and the special examiners came at four different times, incurring the expense of coming from Washington on four separate trips instead of taking the four cases at one time. They were all pending at the same time and could all have been examined at one time. They came at four different times, which delayed all of the cases. There has been an unwarrantable delay in case after case. I can not see any reason at all for it, and there is no excuse for it. I do not know what to make of it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can see no reason for it, either, unless it be that there was some difficulty in securing the necessary evidence.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Not at all. The evidence was easy. I have in my pocket now a case where the evidence has all been supplied, and yet I have seen a letter from the Pension Department demanding that the same evidence be furnished again, and the evidence has been supplied.

Mr. RUCKER. I am sure there is some mistake about that. But I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee to tell us if there is any other bureau in the Government treated in this way?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; for there has been no necessity for this sort of a provision in any other bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], speaking so resolutely

for economy. I believe that, of all the bureaus of all the departments in the Government, the last place where there should be any cheese-paring spirit is the Bureau of Pensions, because it is so intimately connected with the good and welfare of American homes. Its action means comfort in old age for worthy pensioners. It means that those who served the country in its hour of stress and labor should be treated not only courteously and efficiently but promptly. I yield to no man in my expression of gratitude to those who did their part in the days when men were needed; and whenever a claim is presented to the Bureau of Pensions it should receive prompt consideration. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] says they should have all the help that is necessary. Well, if that be so, the gentleman ought to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman pardon me? If the amendment which is now pending be adopted, it will not add a single man to the roll who is not now provided for.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. It merely keeps in office those who are there, and who, in my opinion, are insufficient to do the work.

Mr. LANGLEY. And it gives a chance for the promotion of worthy employees.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. The gentleman quotes the chief clerk of the Bureau of Pensions. I am going to quote the deputy commissioner, Mr. Tieman. I presume the deputy commissioner is rated a little higher than the chief clerk.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman pardon me for just one moment in that connection, to say one word that is personal?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER. The Deputy Commissioner of Pensions of the United States, Mr. Tieman, came to Washington as my private secretary. He was with me, my confidential man, for 15 years. He got the place he has to-day on the recommendation of a large number of the membership of this House, by reason of his faithfulness, his fidelity, and his knowledge of pension matters. There is no better man in the employ of the Government to-day than the Deputy Commissioner of Pensions. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. That is right.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I look upon the postponement of a petition by a veteran or a widow or dependent children as the refinement of cruelty by this Government. [Applause.] I can readily understand that old men and old women may be passing away in poverty, in sorrow, in tears, simply by virtue of the fact that the Government of the United States is lax in its prosecution of their petition. Cite to me anything more diabolical than the postponement of a worthy petition by a veteran of the Civil War.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I will.

Mr. LOBECK. Are not the most of these petitioners women?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Yes.

Mr. LOBECK. And the postponement in their case is more severe than it would be if it was in the case of a man?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Absolutely so. This House has done something for the women in generously voting them suffrage, but they are saying to these old widows, "We will consider your petition months from now." I am going to read a letter from the deputy commissioner to me, and it happens, by the way, that it is dated January 10, 1918, the same date as the letter read by the gentleman from Tennessee from the chief clerk. It is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, January 10, 1918.

Hon. GEORGE F. O'SHAUNESSY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. O'SHAUNESSY: Answering inquiries made in your letter of the 8th instant in regard to delays in this bureau "in answering letters and settling claims," you are advised, in addition to the information contained in the attached report of the chief clerk of the bureau at the end of the last calendar year, that of the 80,000 active pending claims it is estimated that 20,000 are widows' claims, under the act of September 8, 1916 (the Ashbrook law), in which completing evidence has been filed.

It has been the practice to consider these claims in the order in which the evidence was filed, and claims in which evidence was received up to June 19, 1917, are now being handled in their regular turn. First calls for evidence are being made in claims received up to November 1. Indian-war claims (act of Mar. 4, 1917) are about 60 days in arrears of reports from official sources in regard to the fact of service and length of same.

Other classes of claims are either practically current or within 60 days of being so.

Of the number of pieces of mail received during the last calendar year 67,000 were congressional letters. Except when they related to claims in certain stages of adjudication, replies to these letters are current in a majority of the divisions of the bureau. In those divisions where correspondence is heaviest replies are sometimes delayed from 10 days to 3 weeks. The delay in answering miscellaneous correspondence is much longer, often from 3 to 6 months.

In this connection I will say that 915 persons are employed in the bureau in the performance of clerical duties, and the average age of these employees is 57 years. I beg to say, further, that the difficulties under which the bureau is laboring could be entirely removed if the 25 per cent limitation clause inserted in the appropriation act, and which relates to the Pension Bureau alone, were eliminated. This would permit the appointment of such clerical help as is needed to keep the work more nearly current and to obviate those conditions which result from a restriction preventing the most effective adjustment of the force employed in the bureau to the labors to be performed in administering pension laws now in existence or which may hereafter be enacted.

Very truly, yours,

E. C. TIEMAN,
Deputy Commissioner.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In view of that statement of the Assistant Pension Commissioner, will the gentleman tell the committee why they have not filled the vacancies of the \$1,800 clerk and the \$1,600 clerk, which have existed down there for several months?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. It has been answered by some gentlemen on this side, that the work of these men is of a special character, and may be men in another division or another class which they have not the power to fill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are all clerks in that class.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I do not care whether they are specially trained or not. What I am here advocating is a decent treatment of the Pension Bureau and of the people that have to do business with the Pension Bureau.

It ill becomes the Congress of the United States to take such a position as is attempted to be taken by the chairman of the committee in this bill. [Applause.] Let me say that my complaint was not based on pique, it was based on delay. I am not one of those fractious individuals that takes umbrage at the slightest delay. There must have been some continuing reason for my interrogation of the bureau. While I recognize the splendid work they are doing I would strengthen their hands by retaining the force which in my opinion is not sufficient to do the work.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman let me interrupt him to ask a question of the chairman of the committee at this point?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER. At the time of the hearings, I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee if there was not very much discussion between the subcommittee and the Deputy Commissioner of Pensions that was not put in the hearings?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There may have been some discussions.

Mr. RUCKER. In that conversation did not Mr. Tieman make it plain as possible that what he needed was to cut the shackles that bound him by taking out this 25 per cent limitation?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can not get some limitation on this debate.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to see if we can not get some limitation on this debate. I am a little embarrassed in asking it, because I consumed so much of the time myself. I am not going to object to the extension of the time of the gentleman from Rhode Island, but I am going to see if we can not agree on a certain length of time. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in 30 minutes.

Mr. RUCKER. Reserving the right to object, I believe if the gentleman will modify his request a little there will be no objection to it. The gentleman says "on the paragraph and all amendments thereto."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. We have discussed the matter at great length.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is so genial that I want to pay my respects to him once more before I quit. Let the gentleman confine his request "to this amendment."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I object.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will make it 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee modifies his request by making it 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. RUCKER. Under certain conditions, I want five minutes. Does the gentleman's request contemplate that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Chair will control that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall close in 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Tennessee has some understanding as to who shall occupy that time. He will have to inform the Chair in regard to that.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I object to the request.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the motion by making it 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall conclude at the expiration of 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Madden] moves to amend it by making it 15 minutes. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee as amended.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I thought I was given five minutes under this combination. I would like to conclude in an orderly manner.

The CHAIRMAN. But the time of the gentleman from Rhode Island had expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I asked unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. That was not agreed to.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island have 2 minutes outside of the 15 minutes agreed upon.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I do not feel embarrassed because I take very little time of the House, but I would like to call attention to this salient fact, that we should be guided by the information of the deputy commissioner and not by that of the chief clerk. We should be guided by the necessities of those who do business with the Bureau of Pensions, and we should not be taken off our feet by this economical plea when we are extending the salaries of everybody in the employ of the Government. We have been cited to the case of some people down in the bureau who have been working there perhaps 50 years and have been receiving the munificent salary of \$2,000 a year. We are cited to that fact in order that we may now be economical. We are given in minute detail and refined percentages, so to speak, the number of men who are receiving \$1,800 a year, of those who receive \$1,400 a year, when the cry throughout the land is the increased cost of living, and then we, the Congress of the United States, say: "Do not mind the pensioners, do not mind the veterans, do not mind the widows, but keep on reducing the clerical force, and thus postpone the day when deserving pensioners obtain a hearing. I am opposed to that policy of delay." [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, it is true that the original veteran pensioner is passing very fast. Not long will it be until he is but a memory. There were more than 30,000 of them who died last year. The State of Indiana contributed 224,000 original enlistments. There are but 18,000 remaining in Indiana of those original enlistments; but it is not true that the pension work is decreasing. The evidence shows that it is increasing, and the evidence and the practical experience of those who have to do daily with the Pension Department do not conform to the testimony of the chief clerk as submitted to the committee. Only this morning I received a letter from an old lady, the widow of an old soldier, who filed her application for a pension in 1916, furnishing all the evidence that was necessary. She has been waiting patiently from that day to this for some result. I have written three different letters on that one case and I have received back a courteous reply every time after some 10 days or three weeks, stating that the case is under consideration, with a view of early determination. I expect that is a stereotyped answer that every gentleman here receives from that office. If this bill passes as it is now reported, 43 of these men go out as a matter of course, according to the statement of the chairman. According to the figures submitted at the hearings more than 100 go out, and 25 per cent of those who die during the current year will not have their places filled.

If the business is increasing rather than decreasing there is no good practical sense in this proposition.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I have only five minutes. On the other hand, there is a very great reason why, especially at this time, an adequate force should be maintained down there. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] states from the hearings that their business is current. It depends on what you call current. If these pension claims, where the evidence is submitted, where there is no question about the proof, remain there unexamined and undetermined for 18 months or two years, then I do not like their idea of currency. The time has come with reference to the pensioner, with reference to the widow of the survivor of the war, when her pension claim in no instance, except in rare cases, should be pending to exceed six months. If there is not sufficient force to make an examination in that time there should be.

I wish to say in passing that if there ever was a time in the history of the world when we should reaffirm the promise that was made during the period from sixty-one to sixty-four, that the survivor of the war and his dependents would be the wards of this Nation and receive its constant care and attention, now is that time. We are asking others to do what they did. We should show by our example here that we are true to the promises then made, and if, forsooth, they are passing so rapidly to the beyond, then we should show that we will be true not only to the last one of them but to their dependents as well. I want to say that if conditions were now as they were during the first quarter of a century after the close of the Civil War, when the old soldier dominated this Congress and the legislation of the country, more regard would be paid to him. Now that he is going and has left a dependent widow or child, the duty is none the less incumbent upon those who are filling the place now on behalf of those who bared their breast that this Nation might survive, and that we might stand as a beacon light for democracy in the world; so that I say that now of all times we should not lay a hand upon this last refuge of the old soldier.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Woon] that we ought to give to this department every clerk essential to transact the business of the Pension Office with the greatest dispatch, but I want to say to the gentleman from Indiana and to the members of this committee that that is just what the committee in reporting this bill has done. The Ashbrook bill threw on the Pension Office a great many new claims, and yet during the year, according to the letter of the chief clerk of that office, with almost a hundred vacancies in the force by reason of military enlistments, and so forth, the commissioner passed upon 165 of those claims under the Ashbrook Act in addition to the regular business. The assistant commissioner testified that by the 1st of June next the work of the office will be current. Let me ask the gentleman from Indiana this question: If there is such great need for clerks down there, why is it that from the commissioner's office there has been detailed all of the year 13 clerks to other departments of the Interior, why is it—

Mr. WOOD of Indiana rose.

Mr. GOOD. I can not yield.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Then why does the gentleman ask the question if he does not want an answer?

Mr. GOOD. Why is it that some of these clerks have been detailed since 1912, if there is a dearth of clerks in that office? Mr. Chairman, this House will find a greater problem confronting it if it adopts this amendment. The Pension Office is disappearing. The Pension Office to-day does not pass on a single claim of any of the men now serving in the Army and the Navy. Those claims go to the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance. One thousand persons, in round numbers, are employed in that office, and the problem is, how we are going to get rid of that large force after all of the work of the Pension Office has disappeared.

The committee took this matter into consideration when it originated this legislation several years ago. This legislation will not result in postponing for a single moment the consideration of a single claim.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I regret I can not.

Mr. RUCKER. It did not have in view the establishment of the War-Risk Bureau five years ago, did it?

Mr. GOOD. No. Every claim that comes before the commissioner must go through a certain course of investigation. It must be sent in many cases out into the field, and the field investigators must investigate the facts that the commissioner desires investigated, and when those reports come back, then if there is a discrepancy in the report that discrepancy must be reconciled, and it is that investigation that takes the time. The trouble is with the red tape in the office and not in an

insufficient number of clerks. Why, if we even adopt this amendment, it does not affect the field force. It affects only the clerks here in the office, and if you have not sufficient clerks to do the work then why does the commissioner permit the details, some of whom have been detailed from 1912 down to the present time? Mr. Chairman, I have in my district an old soldier's home. I have a great deal of correspondence with this department. I would not knowingly do a thing here to-day or in the Committee on Appropriations or anywhere that would postpone for a single minute the consideration of the claims of a soldier or the widow of a soldier. These claimants are getting old, and I sympathize with every effort to aid the Government to pass upon their claims with utmost dispatch. I have their interests in mind when I say this, but I have also in mind the interests of thousands of persons employed in the Pension Office—a disappearing office—and sooner or later you will be called upon to enact a law which practically eliminates a great many of those old and faithful employees, and there is hardly a man on the floor of this House to-day who would want to vote for that kind of a measure.

Mr. RUCKER. Is that the reason the gentleman wants to get rid of these employees a few at a time rather than all at once?

Mr. GOOD. We want to provide that no new ones be appointed, that the old ones remain there doing the work, and there are enough of them to do it promptly, for when this money will be available, according to Mr. Tieman's testimony, the work then will be current, notwithstanding the fact that he had in his office almost 100 persons less than were appropriated for, and he had in his office about 50 less than he will have during the year 1918, if this appropriation is used.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. RUCKER. If this amendment is adopted it will not add one single clerk you have not provided for?

Mr. GOOD. If it would not, the gentleman's argument falls to the ground. Then what is the gentleman complaining about?

Mr. RUCKER. I would strike out this limitation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the members of this committee had the facts before it as the subcommittee had them presented by the officers of the Pension Bureau, in my opinion there would be no question whatsoever but what they would approve and ratify the action of the committee. No one on the committee desires to do aught that will cripple the Pension Bureau, but the committee recognized that the additional work imposed upon the bureau was because of the passage of the Ashbrook law in September, 1917. Under that law 175,000 applications for increases were presented, of which at the present time 165,000 have been disposed of.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not yield in five minutes. Under the two other provisions of that law relating to the granting of increases to widows who had remarried and a pensionable status to those who married after June 27, 1890, the commissioner himself says on page 567 of the hearings that all the work under the Ashbrook law will be current on June 1 of this year. Now, there is no additional legislation pending that will impose additional work upon that bureau except an increase of pensions of soldiers, and yet we see that the existing clerical force have been able to keep up with their work to the extent of 165,000 out of 175,000 applications for increased pensions to widows. But more. The deputy commissioner says that at the time of the hearing in the latter part of last year there were 29 vacancies existing in the respective grades above \$1,000 where he could have appointed five clerks, four of class 4, four of class 3, seven of class 2, and five of class 1. As he did not avail himself of the opportunity under the existing provision to appoint these additional clerks, that was proof positive to the committee that his present force was ample to meet, during the next fiscal year, the present needs, and more than ample to meet the needs of applications under the Ashbrook law which have been presented that will be passed upon and be made current on June 1 of this year. Since we passed this same provision last year we have passed the war-risk insurance law, which takes away all cases of pensions arising after the passage of that law. Now, what work will the Pension Bureau have to consider beginning with the next fiscal year—

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Not as much new pension work as in the past and very little under the Ashbrook law—I can not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. The gentleman asks the question.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not yield. I did not ask the gentleman; he is only pestering me. In the Pension Bureau at the present time there are 172 between the ages of 70 and 80 years.

We realize there are many chances that these men, occupying these high-salaried places, will drop out continually by reason of death. We do not remove anyone, but we say under this provision the Pension Bureau shall not have the privilege of promoting those clerks in the lower grades into these vacancies which are occurring, say, in the \$1,600 and \$1,800 grades, and we say they shall only appoint one in case of every four vacancies. This provision has been in the bill for the last three years. It worked no ill, even with the additional work imposed by the Ashbrook pension law, notwithstanding that the work under that law was great. I say with all frankness that the clerks we provide here, schedule for schedule, in the commissioner's office on July 1, 1918, will be ample to meet all the conditions. As set forth by the gentleman from Iowa, for several years there have been 17 detailed from this office into the respective bureaus of the Department of the Interior, and the Commissioner of Pensions, at any time he wanted those \$1,200, \$1,400, \$1,600, and \$1,800 clerks detailed to those various offices, could command their services or direct their return.

The whole testimony shows that the Pension Bureau has a much of a clerical force as is needed. The question for the committee to determine is whether you are going to accept the judgment of the subcommittee, that spent days and weeks and months in the preparation of this detailed bill, or are going to follow the suggestions of Members who have only a superficial knowledge of the conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. LANGLEY. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 29, noes 42.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee and Mr. RUCKER took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 34, noes 41.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out all of line 17, on page 105, and insert, at the end of line 16, "\$1,600 or less than that sum."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUCKER: Page 105, line 17, strike out "\$2,250 or above that sum" and insert, at the end of line 16, "\$1,600 or less than that sum," so that it will read: "The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to any salary of \$1,600 or less than that sum."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I call for a vote.

Mr. RUCKER. Hold on!

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I make the point that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto has been closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, there are not enough independent men here voting, and I make the point there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-five gentlemen are present, not a quorum.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUCKER. I am not sure that it is a proper question, but I would like to know who is running this bill, this side of the House or that side?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This is a nonpartisan bill, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman does become nonpartisan at times.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. GARNER and Mr. STAFFORD requested tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. RUCKER and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee took their places as tellers.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 8, noes 91.

So the committee refused to rise.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For per diem at not exceeding \$4 in lieu of subsistence for persons employed in the Bureau of Pensions, detailed for the purpose of making special investigations pertaining to said bureau and for actual and other necessary expenses, including telegrams, \$90,000.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox], a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. COX. I offer an amendment to strike out the figure "4" and insert the figure "3."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do this for the purpose of calling the attention of the members of the committee to a very important matter, in my judgment. This morning I received the following telegram, dated Sterling, Ill., March 12, 1918:

Congressman JOHN C. MCKENZIE,
Washington:

Can you secure me point of enlistment of Walter E. Moore, reported among wounded in yesterday's casualty list.

(Signed)

A. J. PLATT, Mayor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are all aware of the fact that the War Department has issued an order that in reporting all soldiers killed and wounded in France the name of the soldier alone shall be given to the public. We are told that Gen. Pershing requested this to be done, and that he did so upon the request of the French Government. When the order was issued I felt, as I believe every Member of this House felt, that it was a mistake, and that instead of doing the thing they expected it to do, it would only aggravate the matter. And this is the first evidence from my district, and it is evidence which will be coming from every district in the United States in a few days, unless that order is changed.

In my judgment it is not necessary in publishing such lists to give all the details, but it would do no harm to say, for example, that Walter E. Moore, of Sterling, Ill., was wounded on a certain date, and not give the regiment or the company, or even the division to which he belonged.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will ask the gentleman if he does not believe it would be better not to give the name at all unless they are going to give us the address?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes; I do; and for this reason: On investigation I have found that this man Moore did not live in Sterling, Ill. Yet his father and mother, when seeing that name published in the local papers or in the Chicago papers, immediately thought perhaps it was their son. Upon investigation I found that the man enlisted in Montana. The effect of the present regulation will be that, if there are 100 Smiths in the Army in France and one Smith should be wounded, the mother of every soldier by the name of Smith in France will not rest until she has word as to whether or not it is her son.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am one of those, as I believe every Member here is, who is in favor of doing everything that will help our Government to win this war, and I would oppose anything that would give the great German Army any information that might aid in taking any advantage of our boys. But when an American boy lays down his life in France, or is even wounded there in upholding the colors of our country, I can see no harm in letting the people of this country know from what locality, at least, that boy came; and I hope that, in the wisdom of the War Department, that they will see the propriety of changing this order, which, to my mind, is uncalled for and unnecessary.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Can the gentleman say whether any information was furnished to our War Department giving the reasons in support of such an order? Can anybody give any sensible reason for it?

Mr. McKENZIE. None; except that they are anxious to keep the Germans from knowing that the American boys are in front of them. But they will find that out.

Mr. LITTLE. That objection would be obviated if we would take them away from there. That would be as good a way as this.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not mean to defend the practice, because I do not yet know enough of the reason for it; but I understand that it is the policy of the department to advise the relatives, or whoever the soldier may have given as his next friend, or next of kin.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. May I have one minute more?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman may have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The department advises those who are given by the soldier as his next friends. That is to say, in the case of the soldier to whom the gentleman refers, his friends in Montana were advised?

Mr. McKENZIE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. So that the parents of that boy, if they understand it, might feel perfectly safe unless they receive advice from the department itself; that is, if they understood it.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes. But the unfortunate part of this order is that here is a mother, perhaps, in Sterling, Ill., who thinks this is her son. She will not be advised, while the mother in Montana will be, and rightfully.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And the mother in Illinois, if she understood the policy of the War Department, would feel perfectly safe, because she would know if it were her boy she would be informed, because the department has stated that the parents of soldiers would be advised.

Mr. McKENZIE. I know that the War Department is doing what it believes to be the best in this matter, but I do not believe that even the War Department of our country can make no mistake, and I believe this is a mistake.

Mr. LITTLE. What difference would it make to the Germans to know whether the boy came from Austin, Tex., or Topeka, Kans.?

Mr. McKENZIE. I can not see what difference it would make to the Kaiser of Germany, or to Von Hindenberg, or Ludendorff, or any great German general to know that John Smith, of Elizabeth, Ill., for example, was killed in front of their lines if the regiment was not named.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. GLASS. Do you imagine that the French Government, after three years' experience, would have made an idle request of this Government? Of course, all of us ascribe a patriotic motive to the gentleman who makes this motion; but do you suppose the French Government, after three years of actual experience, would have presented an idle request to this Government, not backed by a good reason?

Mr. McKENZIE. No; I do not. I impute no bad motive to the French Government, but I will say to my friend that in cutting off or denying the right to publish the number of the regiment or the division, that, in my judgment, is a wise military regulation; but I can not for my life see, when the name of a man is published as having come from a certain place, giving no connection whatever with the military organization, why it would affect in any way the safety of the other Americans in France. On the other hand, it would do away with this uncertainty that is bound to sweep over this land of ours if this order continues.

Mr. GLASS. As the gentleman from Tennessee has indicated, there ought not to be any uncertainty if the people will just understand that the nearest of kin or nearest in friendship will always be first apprised of any casualty by the War Department. Then nobody else ought to have any apprehension in the matter.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. GILLET. I ask that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLET. Does not the gentleman think it possible that a mother, seeing only the name of her son in the paper, might

suspect that the War Department has failed to notify her, or that the notification had not reached her?

Mr. GLASS. Yes. That would be a very distressing circumstance. While I do not fully understand the situation myself, I can not conceive that the French Government, after three years of war, would make a request of this sort if there was not something of vital importance behind it. My own view is that there has been too much publicity about these matters.

Mr. McKENZIE. I may say to the gentleman that I feel this way in regard to this matter, so far as the French Government is concerned. I can not help but feel that there must be somewhere along the line a mistake in properly deciphering the cablegrams giving these orders, because I can not understand how the French Government could raise this question.

Mr. GILLET. Is the gentleman certain that the French Government did request the action taken by our War Department?

Mr. GLASS. No; I am not certain that the French Government did request the action taken by the War Department, except it has been specifically stated in the newspapers that the order was issued in pursuance to the request of the French Government, based on the supposition that these publications would furnish valuable information to the enemy, and that the request was concurred in by the English Government. Whether that is true or not I am not prepared to state.

Mr. MADDEN. There is one thing you can not change, a mother's hope or fear for her boy, and there ought not to be anything done to make it more difficult for her to bear the burden of sending her boy to the front than is necessary.

Mr. GLASS. Well, some of us have as much affection for our boys as others have, and if the boy is killed those who are most concerned are his parents, and if the parents are notified that ought to be sufficient. This thing of thinking that the public should be informed of everything that is done is a mistake, and I say that although I am a newspaper man myself.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman I simply want to say that some of us have not the good fortune to have boys in this Army, but I think every man in the House feels the same way about it, and I am sure he does, that notwithstanding the fact that we may not have sons of our own there we are interested in every boy that we know from our communities.

Mr. GLASS. Oh, I think so, too.

Mr. McKENZIE. And when we see the familiar name of a man in the list of casualties we would like to know whether he is from our community or not. [Applause.]

Mr. GLASS. I will say to my friend that I intended nothing personal in my observation. I am just insisting on my view that the French Government, if it did make this request, must have had some very good reason for it or it would not have made it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The British Government to-day publishes in the London Times daily a list of casualties. You can find the paper in the Library. If they have discontinued the practice it has been within the last month or so. They publish a casualty list, giving the command of the man who is killed or wounded. You will find long lists published each day. The French Government has never published any casualty list at any time. It has been the fixed policy of the French Government not to do that. But how much more dangerous is it for us to publish these lists than it is for the British Government to do so?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say right in that connection that so far as I am personally concerned I have no ill feeling in this matter, but I simply call the attention of the committee to the fact that in my judgment it would be infinitely better not to publish the lists at all than to publish them as they are now published.

Mr. GLASS. I do not ascribe any captious motive to my friend in bringing this to the attention of the House. Responding to the interruption just now, I apprehend that the reason why there is no objection to the publication of the lists that we see in the English newspapers is the fact that it is as well known to the German Army as it is to the English Army itself precisely what part of the front the English troops occupy. There may be good reasons for not wanting the Germans to know just what particular part of the front the American Army occupy at this time.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. Is it not the practice also to publish the names in the Canadian newspapers? I have seen in Canadian newspapers lists of names, giving the company, regiment, and division to which a man belongs.

Mr. McKENZIE. I can not say as to that. I do not know.

Mr. ROBBINS. Further, in answer to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the gentleman seems to think there is a great objection to publishing the names of American soldiers, on the ground that it is not known that the Americans are over there. Is it not known that Americans have been captured, and that they have been in the front trenches for some time? Of course the Germans know that they are there.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment just to say this: All the statements that I have seen in the press in connection with this order of the War Department to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] has just addressed himself have been more or less critical, and it has seemed to me that perhaps the press has inadvertently failed to carry to the next of kin of soldiers information that it could very properly carry, and in the carrying of which it would render great service. That is, that it is the policy of the War Department, under this kind of an order, as it was before, immediately upon receipt of information of a casualty to advise the next of kin of the soldier of that fact. If this could be clearly understood—and if this order is to continue it ought to be understood in the country—then the parents and the next of kin of soldiers of the same name would not be alarmed if they did not receive advices.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, they would.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Because, if they understood perfectly that they would be advised by the department, I do not think there would be any occasion for alarm.

Mr. MADDEN. You never could make a mother understand it though.

Mr. WASON. Can the gentleman inform the House how soon after the information reaches the War Department means are taken to inform the interested relatives?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not know, except that I had this experience: There were two young men from my district on the *Tuscania*. One of them was saved and one of them was lost. I myself made inquiries as to both of them before definite information was received by the department. It had been promised that I would be advised. About 3 o'clock on a Sunday morning I called the department by telephone, and I learned that they had received definite information as to the young man who was saved. They had finished deciphering a cablegram at 1.30 a. m., and had sent out a telegram to the father of the survivor at 1.45 a. m. That was one experience. As to the case of the one who was lost I do not know how long it was before they had definite information. Of course, I do not know how long it takes to get the telegrams out, but that has been one case in my experience.

Mr. WASON. Does the gentleman understand that the department communicates with the relatives of the soldiers by wire?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. By wire in all instances where it is possible to send a wire. They have the telegraphic address and the mail address of the next of kin, as I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I move to amend the pro forma amendment by striking out two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moves to strike out two words.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I just want to make this suggestion, Mr. Chairman. This is a matter in which everybody is deeply concerned, of course, and the mothers of the country are anxious and will continue to be so. Here is the situation: We have selected to take charge of our armies in France men in whom we have absolute confidence. I think everybody has confidence in Gen. Pershing as a military man and also confidence in those who serve under him. The news comes and is published in the paper that certain named men have been killed or wounded. Just as soon as possible thereafter the department notifies the next of kin, the parents of the boy, that their boy is killed or wounded. The other mothers in the country are, of course, extremely anxious. Now, here is the question: If their sons have not been killed or injured the day of their anxiety and sorrow will soon end; but it is the deliberate judgment of the men who have charge of our armies on the field that it would be to the best interest of the boys who are not injured if this information were not published. So they say to the mothers, "While you may undergo a few hours or a few days of unnecessary anxiety, feeling that this may be your boy, it is better that you do that, because by giving out this information it may give such an advantage of the enemy as may result in injury and perhaps death to your boy."

Now, who is the best judge of that? I think there can be no two sides to that question. The men in France who are charged with this great responsibility—I do not know whether this is the advice of the French Government or the English Government, but I understand from the press that it is and that Gen. Pershing

himself agrees to it. If that be true, is it not better for all of us that we suffer these few days of great anxiety than to have a policy adopted which may result in the death of many more boys?

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not believe that it would be just as well to say that 20 Americans, or 50 Americans, were killed on the 14th of March or the 15th of March, and just give the number without the names? Would it not be just as valuable to the public as to publish a string of names, and would it not be advisable to leave the names out entirely?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I confess that to my uninformed judgment on the subject that would answer every purpose. But the general in charge of the Army over there says that it is all right to publish this other information.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very instructive and illuminating discussion, and I think it deserves a better audience. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee and Mr. RUCKER.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were 7 ayes and 84 noes.

The CHAIRMAN. There is not a quorum present, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Fairchild, B. L.	Kreider	Roberts
Austin	Fairchild, G. W.	LaGuardia	Rodenberg
Barkley	Fess	Lee, Ga.	Rowe
Black	Flynn	Lenroot	Rowland
Caldwell	Fordney	Lesher	Sanford
Campbell, Kans.	Foss	Litt page	Scott, Pa.
Campbell, Pa.	Freeman	Lufkin	Scully
Cantrill	Fuller, Mass.	McClintic	Sears
Capstick	Gallivan	McCormick	Siegel
Carew	Garland	McCulloch	Small
Carter, Mass.	Garrett, Tex.	McFadden	Snyder
Clark, Fla.	Goodall	McKeown	Steenerson
Clark, Pa.	Gould	McKinley	Stephens, Nebr.
Coady	Graham, Pa.	McLemore	Stevenson
Cooper, Ohio	Greene, Vt.	Magee	Sullivan
Cooper, Wis.	Hamill	Maher	Switzer
Copley	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mann	Tague
Costello	Haugen	Mason	Talbot
Crago	Hayes	Meeker	Templeton
Crisp	Heaton	Miller, Minn.	Treadway
Currie, Mich.	Heintz	Miller, Wash.	Van Dyke
Curry, Cal.	Holland	Morin	Vare
Davidson	Hollingsworth	Mott	Venable
Dies	Hood	Neely	Walker
Doelling	Husted	Nolan	Watson, Va.
Doremus	James	Parker, N. Y.	White, Ohio
Doughton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Peters	Wilson, Ill.
Drane	Jones, Va.	Phelan	Wilson, La.
Drukker	Kahn	Platt	Winslow
Dunn	Kehoe	Porter	Woodyard
Eagan	Kelley, Mich.	Price	Zihlman
Eagle	Kennedy, R. I.	Ragsdale	
Edmonds	Key, Ohio	Ratney	
Esch	Kraus	Riordan	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 10358 and finding itself without a quorum, under the rule had caused the roll to be called, and 295 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he presented a list of the absentees to the House.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. When the point of order was made the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] had the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 105, line 22, strike out the figures "\$90,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$120,000."

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, a short time ago the committee saw fit to retain in the bill the provision for limiting the number of employees in the Bureau of Pensions, and to say that in vacancies occurring but 25 per cent should be appointed to fill the places vacated.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] offered an amendment to do away with that practice and to continue in the Bureau of Pensions a sufficient force to deal with the work done there. It was my privilege to read a letter at that time from the Bureau of Pensions, signed by the deputy commissioner, in which he very clearly set forth that one of the reasons why the work of the bureau was behind was on account of this system or practice that had been incorporated into law by the House three or four years ago. That is past history, however. I happen to be speaking just now to a greater number of men than were present in the Chamber a little while ago, and I am dealing with a related proposition. My amendment now is to increase the appropriation for the field force from \$90,000 to \$120,000, and I calculate that the increase of \$30,000 will provide about 20 extra men in the field. With that force we will do away with the revolting spectacle of worthy pensioners, both men and women, seeking what is theirs by right and frequently dying before relief is given to them by the Pension Bureau.

There is no question about it that men and women frequently die before these investigating men, who are charged with many and various duties, get around to their cases; and so we have the spectacle of the United States Government enacting a law asking people to submit their claims to the Pension Bureau in time, being told either directly or indirectly through their Congressmen, "Your case has been referred to a special investigator, and when he gets time your case will be taken up." Generally speaking, these people are very old; they are practically verging on the grave, waiting for the final summons, and in many instances, as I have said, by the time the investigator gets around there is crepe hanging on the door. It amounts to this, that we want to put into the field a sufficient number of men so that there will not elapse, as there did elapse in a case in which I was personally interested not very long ago, one full year before the matter was disposed of. It is not the fault of the Bureau of Pensions; it is no fault of the Pension Commissioner; it is no fault of the force there. It is the fault of the piecayune policy of Congress. I wish to protest against that piecayune policy. These veterans may not have the same potential power now; they do not have so many votes perhaps, but their cause is just as sacred as ever [applause], and they are just as worthy of pensions as ever, and we should embrace this opportunity of providing a sufficient number of men to go out and do their work, not alone efficiently but promptly, in behalf of worthy men and women. [Applause.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] will be adopted. Undoubtedly the work of the Pension Bureau is in arrears. The whole issue is whether responsibility should be placed upon the officials of the Pension Bureau or upon the Members of this House for failure to provide sufficient funds. I take it from the statement made by the gentleman from Rhode Island that the responsibility rests with the committee and with Congress. If that be true, then there is no question but that we should do something to relieve the situation. The gentleman from Rhode Island cites a case in his district where more than a year elapsed between the filing of the claim and the granting of the pension. I have had a great number of cases in my district where more than a year elapsed before the cases of widows of Civil War veterans could be adjudicated.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman understand the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island to permit the employing of extra help down there?

Mr. KEATING. I understood his amendment is to increase the force in the field.

Mr. WALSH. It does not increase the force in the field; it simply increases the amount of per diem for subsistence.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. I am glad to hear the gentleman express the views he has expressed, but I feel that I should say to him that the Committee on Appropriations determined that the Pension Office shall not have an adequate force.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to reflect upon the Committee on Appropriations, and I hesitate to believe that the committee would deprive the Pension Office of a sufficient force. But on this point there can be no doubt—the Pension Bureau is months and almost years behind its work. I can secure from the files of my office many, many letters from widows who filed their claims more than a year ago, and those claims have not been adjudicated. Many of these women are well known in the communities where they live, and there is no question about their right to a pension. I contend that these claims should be taken up and disposed of speedily.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. SANFORD. Does the gentleman think the Pension Bureau ought to consider a widow's claim out of its order because of the fact that it has an inquiry from a Member of Congress respecting it?

Mr. KEATING. I hope the Pension Bureau will give some consideration to inquiries from Members of Congress. I have written some myself.

Mr. SANFORD. Will the gentleman kindly answer my particular question? We had here this morning a statement that there were some 60,000 letters received from Congressmen during the last year. It occurs to me that that alone would disrupt the Pension Bureau. Does the gentleman think that the Pension Bureau ought to consider a widow's claim out of its order because of the fact that a Member of Congress has inquired about it?

Mr. KEATING. No; unless the Member of Congress submits some good reason why it should do so. I think Members of Congress should be treated like other citizens of the United States.

Mr. SANFORD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. I can not believe that the letters written by Members of Congress have disrupted the Pension Bureau, and I submit it is up to the present Committee on Appropriations to prove that the present management of the Pension Office is inefficient or to grant a sufficient force to transact the business of that office.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. Is it not fair to assume that a large per cent, probably one-half, of those 60,000 letters that have gone to the bureau are inquiries about undue delays?

Mr. KEATING. I think that is true to a great extent. It has been my own experience.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to say that I was misinformed. I asked the Clerk a little while ago, and my hurried reading of the paragraph led me to believe that the amendment would be applicable. I find that it is not. It merely provides for a per diem, and of course it would involve the offering of an amendment to the force in question. Now, there is in the bill no specific number of field men mentioned, and it would involve a study of the preceding paragraph on page 104 to work out the number who are available for this work.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me there?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I do.

Mr. LANGLEY. I was employed for a good many years in that bureau and know something about its work. As I understand it, the gentleman's amendment proposes to increase the allowance for per diem for the field men.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. What I desired to do was to increase the number of men.

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, the gentleman can accomplish that in effect by the amendment he is proposing. It would have that effect because they could detail, if they had a larger lump sum to pay this per diem, a larger number of clerks for the field work, and thus expedite it. If that is the purpose of the amendment it is all right.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. If it can be done, if the appropriation of \$120,000 instead of \$90,000 could be used for increasing the number of men upon field work, then I leave my amendment stand as it is and allow it to be answered by the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I will.

Mr. WALSH. If it does what the gentleman from Kentucky suggests, the gentleman from Rhode Island and the gentleman from Kentucky would have to wait more than 10 days to get an answer to their letters if they are going to detail a lot of their present clerks on field work.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I am willing to wait for answers to letters; but I want those people who put in definite, legitimate claims—

Mr. WALSH. The gentlemen were criticizing the bureau for not answering letters.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I did not criticize the bureau; I am criticizing Congress.

Mr. LANGLEY. No; it was not my intention, either, to criticize the bureau. I was merely showing that it is not up with its work, and that therefore its force should not be depleted now.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Colorado had been here during the discussion upon the preceding paragraph he would have heard read a letter from

the chief clerk of the Pension Bureau, in which he stated that notwithstanding the fact that his force had been depleted 100 in number from what it was a year ago, on account of resignations of members of the force going into the military and other service, that by putting in better methods and cutting out, as he expressed it, the red tape, the bureau was keeping the regular work current. As to this particular amendment the gentleman from Rhode Island has offered, the amendment increases this appropriation from \$90,000 to \$120,000 for per diem in lieu of subsistence, for the men in the field who make examinations of these pension claims. They have 52 men now detailed for that particular purpose. The Pension Bureau has not asked for a single increase in the number now detailed, and if this committee undertakes to vote this increased appropriation, you are voting for something the Pension Bureau has not asked and does not desire. Now, as a matter of fact, the committee raised this appropriation from \$80,000 to \$90,000. It gave them an increase of \$10,000, and in addition to that allowed an increase of the per diem from \$3 to \$4 per day. So I repeat, gentlemen, that certainly in this day and in this time, when we are taxing the people as we are and when our Government is being put to an expense never before known in its history, we ought not to increase this appropriation \$30,000 when the Commissioner of Pensions himself has not asked us to do it and does not expect it. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. The gentleman, I presume, will not question the correctness of the letter which I read to the committee a little while ago, in which the deputy commissioner states as follows—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yielded to a question. I did not yield for an argument.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. This is my question. Now, I want to ask the gentleman this question. The deputy commissioner said this:

I beg to say, further, that the difficulties under which the bureau is laboring could be entirely removed if the 25 per cent limitation clause inserted in the appropriation act, and with relation to the Pension Bureau alone, were eliminated.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That has no application to this amendment.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Let me read:

This would permit the appointment of such clerical help as is needed to keep the work more nearly current and to obviate those conditions which result from a restriction preventing the most effective adjustment of the force employed in the bureau to the labors to be performed in administering pension laws now in existence or which may hereafter be enacted.

Very truly, yours—

And so forth.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, the gentleman asks you to increase this appropriation \$30,000 in order to further decrease that clerical force and send it into the field, when the Commissioner of Pensions has not asked for it and does not say it is necessary.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield, if I have time.

Mr. TOWNER. Very reluctantly, evidently.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, not at all; I will gladly yield to the gentleman, as I always do.

Mr. TOWNER. I notice that the estimate of the department, which the gentleman says was not increased, is \$101,600. Upon what ground does the gentleman tell the committee that he has increased the appropriation rather than diminished it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Why, the appropriation for the current year is \$80,000—

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And we have increased it to \$90,000.

Mr. TOWNER. I understood the gentleman to say you increased the estimate—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; we never increase estimates, I will say to the gentleman. We never allow to a department more than is asked, because it has been my observation and experience that a department never asks for a less sum than is actually needed and very frequently asks for a great deal more.

Mr. TOWNER. Why does the gentleman and the committee reduce the estimates of the department in this case? Ought they not to have at least made the amount what was estimated for, \$101,600, instead of \$90,000?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The committee, I will say to the gentleman, allowed \$10,000 increase, making \$90,000. The committee felt, not being asked for additional examiners in the field, that the bureau could get along and take care of the extra increase of per diem with this \$10,000.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 20, noes 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Patent Office: Commissioner, \$5,000; first assistant commissioner, \$4,500; assistant commissioner, \$3,500; chief clerk (who shall be qualified to act as principal examiners), \$3,000; 5 law examiners, at \$2,750 each; examiner of classification, \$3,600; 5 examiners in chief, at \$3,500 each; 2 examiners of interferences, at \$2,700 each; examiners of trade-marks and designs—1 \$2,700, first assistant \$2,400, 6 assistants at \$1,500 each; examiners—45 principals at \$2,700 each, 90 first assistants at \$2,400 each, 90 second assistants at \$2,100 each, 90 third assistants at \$1,800 each, 90 fourth assistants at \$1,500 each; financial clerk, who shall give bond in such amount as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, \$2,250; librarian, who shall be qualified to act as an assistant examiner, \$2,000; 6 chiefs of divisions, at \$2,000 each; 3 assistant chiefs of divisions, at \$1,800 each; private secretary, to be selected and appointed by the commissioner, \$1,800; translator of languages, \$1,800; clerks—9 of class 4, 9 of class 3, 17 of class 2, 135 of class 1, 91 at \$1,000 each; 3 skilled draftsmen, at \$1,200 each; 4 draftsmen, at \$1,000 each; 90 copyists; 40 copyists, at \$720 each; 3 messengers (one transferred to building for Interior Department offices); 33 assistant messengers (two transferred to building for Interior Department offices); 13 laborers, at \$600 each (four transferred to building for Interior Department offices); 45 examiners' aids, at \$600 each; 24 copy pullers, at \$480 each, who shall be selected without regard to apportionment; in all, \$1,416,500.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I shall not ask the committee to return to the item on page 101, which provides for the force of the General Land Office, but I shall beg the indulgence of the committee to discuss that item for a few moments. I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber late Saturday afternoon when this item was reached, and therefore unable to discuss it at that time. I should not, however, have offered an amendment had I been here, as I realize that the committee would not accept without further consideration such an amendment as should be offered. But I do hope that if in the Senate this item shall be considerably modified, the number of clerks considerably increased, and the appropriation increased, the conferees representing the House will see their way clear to approve the increases which will be asked for.

The General Land Office is one of the old-established institutions of the Government. It has been growing for three-quarters of a century and more, and in the main the salaries paid in that office have not been much increased in more than 50 years. The result is that men in that office, having exceedingly important questions to pass upon, aggregating in the course of the year property values of hundreds of millions of dollars, receive salaries much lower than those paid to officials in other and newer bureaus of the Government whose duties are very much less onerous, trying, responsible, and important than those of the law clerks and law examiners of the Land Office.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office, one of the most efficient of all of our public servants, has for the past two years been endeavoring to secure an increase in the force of his office and some increases in the salaries of some of the officials of his bureau. He himself should receive an increase of at least a thousand dollars a year, but has not asked for it. I realize that the subcommittee having to do with all of the multiplied affairs of the Government, in all the executive departments provided for in this bill, can not be fully informed as to the needs of any one, much less all, of the bureaus of the Government.

I am, therefore, not criticizing the members of the committee or the subcommittee because the increase in clerks and the increases in salaries that the commissioner asked for have not been granted. I do, however, believe a careful consideration of the arguments made by the commissioner and all the facts he presented would have fully justified the committee in granting practically all he asked.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office asked for 26 additional clerks, with salaries of from \$1,000 to \$1,600, and amounting in the aggregate to \$32,400. In addition to this, he asked certain increases of from \$100 to \$500 in the salaries of some of the law clerks and examiners in his office. Had all the increases in clerical force and all the increases in salaries requested been granted, my opinion is that the commissioner would still be likely to be short of the necessary force to keep current the people's business coming before that office. Had he been granted the increases in salaries, those increases would not have brought the salaries of the men who would have been the beneficiaries of the increases as high as the salaries of men occupying corresponding positions in new bureaus by several hundred dollars per annum in any one case.

The commissioner made a very strong case before the committee I thought. I can see that the members of the subcommittee might not have realized the force of all the statements made, lacking, as they necessarily are, complete familiarity with the workings of the bureau. The Commissioner of the General Land Office is a very modest man—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. And while he stated his case clearly, possibly he did not state it with the vigor and vehemence that other gentlemen might, and therefore possibly the necessity and importance of these increases did not occur to the subcommittee. This is a part of what the commissioner said. The chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, asked the commissioner as to the condition and progress of work in his office, to which Mr. Tallman replied:

It is not in such good condition as it was a year ago.

Mr. BYRNS. How is it in volume as compared with a year ago?

Mr. TALLMAN. The volume of business has increased.

Mr. BYRNS. You mean without taking into consideration the work in connection with the stock-raising homestead act?

Mr. TALLMAN. Yes; without taking that into consideration.

Then the commissioner went on to state the various causes for the increase of the work in his bureau. I shall not take the time to read two paragraphs in which he summed up in the main the important classes of work requiring additional help in the office. They appeal strongly to anyone familiar with public-land matters, and all of those from the West who know about these classes of increased business realize how they have been growing in the work of the office and how important they are. It might have been thought by some that the discussion held a few moments ago with regard to the working force of a certain office was from the standpoint of the interest of the clerks. I certainly have no such purpose of serving any individual's interest in what I am saying in regard to the Land Office. I am thinking only of the people's business—the people's business, which is efficiently handled in this bureau of the Government. No Member from the West has any special favors to ask of the General Land Office.

We simply desire to have the Land Office furnished with sufficient force, paid proper salaries, to secure that speedy, careful, faithful attention to the public business which is necessary. The commissioner made it very clear how a half dozen new pieces of legislation and a Supreme Court decision had very greatly increased the business of his office in the last year, without taking into consideration the new stock-raising homestead act. Now, how about that act? Here is what the commissioner said about it:

Now, the stock-raising homestead act is quite far-reaching; in fact, it is developing into the most important land legislation we have had for a good many years. I kept figures on it up to a few weeks ago, at which time there had been a total of over 60,000 entries, covering a gross area of some 24,000,000 acres. Now, that is 8,000,000 acres more than the total business of the year before in the shape of new business. I estimated for 26 clerks in the deficiency bill, thinking we would need them immediately. Fortunately we have not needed them so badly and will not until the appropriation we have under consideration comes into effect, for the reason that the entries under this stock-raising homestead act are not allowed until the land is designated by the Secretary of the Interior.

So, while we have gotten along, as it happens, fairly well without those 26 additional clerks, we will need all of them, and probably many more, to handle that business. I think 26 additional clerks will be sufficient to take up the work for the year and see how it turns out, and ascertain where we stand after working on it for a time.

The commissioner stated that very modestly. As a matter of fact, the business under the stock-raising homestead act alone in the year for which the appropriation in this bill provides will require a large additional force.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has again expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I hope the committee will indulge me for five minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Of the 26 clerks which the commissioner asked for, the committee allowed 8, a little less than one-third; 4 at \$1,200 and 4 at \$1,000. I am somewhat familiar with the business of the General Land Office, as every man from a Western land State is, and after careful inquiry and investigation I am of the opinion that every one of these 26 clerks is needed, needed badly, imperatively, if the public business is to be kept anything like current, if the business of the people is to be properly cared for.

One gentleman with whom I discussed this matter suggested that the war would make some difference in the Land Office business. That is true; but it makes this difference, that in the case of many classes of entries the war will greatly increase the business. Here is what the commissioner said of some of the classes of increases. There are others, some of them growing out of the war:

Mr. TALLMAN. One thing is the very large demand for certified copies of documents and the consequent necessity for searching and examining old records; another cause is new legislation, adding new forms of public-land business; and aside from that it is simply the current demand for public lands. You understand, the final proofs on entries made three and four years ago are just now coming in. The decision of the Supreme Court in what is known as the Deseret case released some 2,000,000 acres of suspended State indemnity selections for immediate adjudication. Much business has resulted from the building of the Alaska Railroad, particularly with respect to railroad town sites. Under the act of March 4, 1915, for the relief of desert-land entrymen, we have taken action on over 5,000 cases since the law was passed. The oil-land controversy, including the administration of contracts under the act of August 25, 1914, has required continuous attention by a considerable number of employees both in the office and in the field. The so-called "surface" acts, such as that of July 17, 1914, add complications to the matter of adjudication. Moreover, as a result of changed laws and policies and numerous withdrawals and restorations, it requires nearly double the work to adjudicate claims, as compared with some years ago. For example, irrigation under the desert act is now mostly by means of large projects; we examined and passed on 130 detailed engineers' reports of our field service on such projects last year. Our original entries, new business, shown in my annual report for last year—that is, for the year ending June 30, 1917—was over 16,000,000 acres of land entries, up to the average for recent years. That does not include any of the stock-raising business, you understand.

Mr. EVANS. That is due fundamentally to the desire of the people to acquire land?

Mr. TALLMAN. I should say so.

Mr. EVANS. And there is more contest work?

Mr. TALLMAN. Yes, sir. The contest work has increased a little lately. It fell off a little during the last two or three years. It is running now in round numbers a little over 5,000 contests from which, in round numbers, 4,000 are cases of default or failure to prosecute or to appeal. For instance, in the oil business in California we have records come to us of hundreds of pages. Those cases involve literally millions of dollars. The same thing is occurring in the Wyoming oil cases. For instance, we had to handle this year and are handling now the Oregon-California land grant. There are 2,300,000 acres which we have to classify. The results of the field examinations all have to come to our office to be fully assembled, examined, and plotted. To do that we had to take the Oregon-California land grant and examine every tract of land that the railroad had ever received or could receive within the grant limits and ascertain from that every acre that the railroad might be entitled to, so as to close that grant. The amount of detail work on a proposition of that kind is very large. It keeps several people working on it all the time. Now, we are getting that classification under way. By next spring we have to furnish the public information as to what was shown by that classification and examination and open those lands to entry. At the same time we have got to prepare schedules showing our cruises of all the timber we have to dispose of and conduct the sales. All of that work has to be done in our office. Under many acts we have to do much original work in the nature of working out the governmental policy. For instance, Congress recently passed a law, the potash-leasing bill, with which you are familiar. It was a very general bill and gave the department very large authority. It is necessary to work out that whole scheme of procedure practically and to consider all of the technical and legal propositions that arise in connection with working out that plan. The same was true as to the leasing of Alaska coal lands.

The war, instead of decreasing the business in the General Land Office, has very considerably increased it; and, in addition to that, very few days pass without some new land legislation, all of which lays a new burden and an additional requirement on the General Land Office. As the public-land area decreases the amount of work connected with entries increases, for we are multiplying the classes of entries, we are constantly making new requirements in regard to almost all classes of entries, we are scrutinizing all classes of entries more carefully than in the past.

This public-land service is one of the most valuable under the flag. It is a service rendered to the pioneers who are developing the undeveloped resources of the country, making two blades of grass grow where one or none grew before, opening rich veins and fountains of mineral wealth, bringing fructifying waters from the mountain streams over the arid wastes, and making them blossom as the rose.

Mr. WALSH rose.

Mr. MONDELL. The public-land service is a service which has aided in creating great Commonwealths amid the mountains and on the desert plains, vastly increasing the wealth of the Nation, and establishing new and flourishing communities in the glorious and golden West. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I rose some little time ago to ask the gentleman to yield, but I was so charmed by his eloquence that I could not prefer the request. The gentleman is an expert upon this particular sort of legislation and probably the best-posted man in the House upon public-land matters.

Mr. MONDELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to ask the gentleman if there is any scheme or plan which is in operation or which may be

put in operation whereby these public lands will at some time or other be turned over to the various States, for them to assume the burden of jurisdiction over them, and thus relieve the General Government of this supervision, which has been exercised for many years?

Mr. MONDELL. The plan and purpose of State ownership has been suggested and promoted at one time and another, but never very successfully.

The western people have never been a unit on the matter, and Congress has never shown any considerable disposition to enact the legislation. There are many people in the West who would be willing to assume the burden.

Mr. WALSH. There is no existing law for it?

Mr. MONDELL. There is not.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk, as a new paragraph, to be inserted at the end of line 6 on page 107.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RUCKER offers the following amendment: Insert as a new paragraph, following line 6 on page 107, the following:

"Appointment shall not be made to any of the positions herein appropriated for in the classified service of the Patent Office not actually filled June 30, 1918, nor shall more than 25 per cent of other vacancies actually occurring in any grade in the classified service of that bureau, during the fiscal year 1919, be filled by original appointment or promotion. The salaries or compensation of all places which may not be filled as hereinabove provided for shall not be available for expenditure, but shall lapse and shall be covered into the Treasury. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to any position with a salary of \$2,250 or above that sum."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, or I will reserve it if the gentleman desires me to—

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, let the gentleman make his point of order. I am not asking any favors.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I make the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. RUCKER. What is the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That it is legislation, and that it can not come under the Holman rule, which retrenches expenditures. There are no vacancies in the Patent Office, such as exist in the Pension Bureau, and therefore it is an entirely different proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical in language with a paragraph found in the bill in another place. If it should be adopted, and there should be three deaths of clerks in the Patent Office, would there not be a saving of money, because it would save three clerks, and one could not be appointed until there were four vacancies? You would have to kill four before one could be appointed. This is the same point that was before the Chair a day or two ago and, I think, the same identical question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will note in that case the Chair particularly inquired, before ruling, whether there were any existing vacancies, and the answer was that there were existing vacancies.

Mr. RUCKER. That answer did not come from me.

The CHAIRMAN. No; it came from the chairman of the committee, based upon the evidence submitted to the committee. The vacancies, as the Chair understood, were of record, and undisputed. The Chair will further call attention to the fact that the amendment proposed presents an entirely different situation from the one heretofore ruled upon. It may be very likely, indeed highly probable, in the light of experience that there will be vacancies during the time to which the amendment relates. But that is a purely speculative proposition. In the case referred to there were actual existing vacancies which could not be filled, provided the paragraph remained in the bill. The retention of that paragraph kept those vacancies from being filled, and that result was, in effect, a reduction of existing employees of the Government, and of official salaries. That reduction brought the paragraph within the benefit of the Holman rule. But the case in hand, is as stated, a speculative proposition. There may be vacancies hereafter arising. It is highly probable that these vacancies will occur, but that is as far as we can go. The Chair can not say, that there is a moral certainty that these vacancies will take place, and unless it is a moral certainty that they will occur, thereby taking that occurrence out of the domain of speculation, the amendment proposed will not operate ex proprio vigore, to reduce expenditures. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair rules let me say that I am not advised, and therefore will not make a statement to the Chair, with reference to whether there are vacancies

there or not. Before we reach another bureau I think I will have the opportunity to find out, and then I will offer this amendment again. For the present I withdraw the amendment, and I move now to amend, on page 107, line 4, by striking out "\$600" and inserting "\$750."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to withdraw the amendment which was read?

Mr. RUCKER. I have tried to withdraw it; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. RUCKER: Page 107, line 4, strike out "\$600" and insert "\$750."

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I am not going to trespass upon the time of this committee and therefore will not ask any extension of time. It might be objectionable to some gentlemen to grant me an extension. I do not want to be interrupted during the few minutes I shall occupy the floor.

Mr. Chairman, there was a time when I was not much in favor of the amendment that has just been offered, and which, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee, was not allowed to be acted upon. Really I had no confidence in its wisdom until recently. I have been converted to the idea that perhaps the limitation upon the appropriations for the Pension Bureau may have some merit. My good friend, the genial gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], I am sure by his solemn and impressive manner impressed upon the minds of the occupants of the galleries that he enjoys some ministerial connection; and I am sure everyone was impressed when they heard the deep pathos of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], who pleaded his devotion to the soldier whose affairs are attended to in the Pension Bureau; and then the gallant, distinguished, and oratorical gentleman who talked with vim and vigor and almost ferocious eloquence. I am sure he and they succeeded in convincing this committee that the very wise provision they wrote into this bill ought by right to remain in the bill, because the Committee of the Whole voted down my amendment to strike it out. But the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] was not willing to let the committee express its judgment on the propriety of making the same identical limitation apply to other Government bureaus. His very actions, to my mind, condemn the language, and I fully understand why he does not want to thus hamper and cripple other bureaus. But I offered, gentlemen, at the end of another paragraph, their own language, language which they incubated upon, if that is the proper word. [Laughter.] I withdraw it. No; it was hatched by the Chief of the Bureau of Efficiency and given to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I know the gentleman does not want to do any injustice to the committee nor to the Bureau of Efficiency. I will say, as I have said before, that the Bureau of Efficiency had absolutely nothing to do with suggesting, preparing, or even intimating this provision.

Mr. RUCKER. I do not want to be interrupted very long or very often by the gentleman because he can get more time than I can.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that it is a singular circumstance that when I pleaded with the gentleman in the most pathetic language I could command to tell us if there was a single other bureau in the Government that is handicapped like this, and although I called his attention to it again while he was on the floor, he refused to answer. I appealed to the gentleman from Iowa, and he promptly denied me the courtesy of a reply and refused to answer. I applied to the loquacious gentleman from Wisconsin who always has an answer for everything and for every one, whether right or wrong—most of the time wrong—and he was so busy talking about something else that he said he could not yield in five minutes, though he knew that he had plenty of time and could get plenty more if he desired it. [Laughter.] These gentlemen could not answer the question without betraying conditions for which this House would not stand. If I had them before an ordinary jury and could compel responses, I think I could develop some facts which would not justify the action of which I complain.

Now, gentlemen, I ask you, in the light of all that has been said, why should not this limitation be placed upon the appropriations for every bureau of the Government if it is placed against one? I seriously doubt if the policy that has been pursued is a wise policy. We are allowing gentlemen who have

grasping dispositions to usurp too much power in the House; and when you undertake to bring people in here to outvote them, the gentlemen resort to all sorts of tactics, even to calling for tellers, in order to make delay in the transaction of the public business; and the gentleman from Iowa seems to have locomotor ataxia and can not walk at all. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 107, line 5, after the word "each," strike out the words "who shall be selected without regard to apportionment."

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment for the purpose of eliciting from the chairman of the committee the reason for this singular provision in the bill that takes out of the classified service the apportionment between the States of 950 employees drawing salaries annually of \$1,416,500. Why is it that they are not to be apportioned among the various States like other employees of the Government?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will read the paragraph, he will notice that the language applies only to 24 copy pullers, at \$480 each.

Mr. ROBBINS. The paragraph does not limit it to that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. ROBBINS. How do you make it appear that way? If that is true, I do not wish to urge my amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will observe the punctuation, he will readily see that it applies only to 24 copy pullers.

Mr. ROBBINS. The paragraph is divided by semicolons all the way through, and that limitation does not apply only to the last four employees, to wit, the copy pullers.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will notice the semicolon, and then follows this language: "Twenty-four copy pullers, at \$480 each, who shall be selected without regard to apportionment; in all, \$1,416,500." I think if the gentleman will examine it closely, he must come to the conclusion that the language to which he objects applies only to the 24 copy pullers. I will say that that was put in upon the request and insistence of the Commissioner of Patents, who said that these copy pullers are boys and that it is impossible to get boys to come here from the States and accept a position at \$480. For that reason he asked that the apportionment be waived with reference to these 24 boys, known as copy pullers, so that he could get them in the District of Columbia. The committee felt that under the circumstances the request ought to be granted.

Mr. ROBBINS. To clarify it you ought to insert "which last-mentioned employees shall be selected without regard to apportionment."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think there is the slightest trouble about the paragraph as it reads; that would simply encumber the bill.

Mr. ROBBINS. There ought to be cleared up now what is ambiguous. You begin at the bottom of page 106, and each class of these employees is set off by a semicolon. It runs right along and there are 45 "examiners' aids," at \$600 each; and then "24 copy pullers, at \$480 each, who shall be selected without regard to apportionment; in all, \$1,416,500."

Where is the limitation that fixes it, so that all of these employees enumerated in this section will not be entitled to be relieved of the restriction of "apportionment" now applied under the civil-service law to these employees?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I just tried to explain to the gentleman that it is contained within those semicolons.

Mr. ROBBINS. I do not so understand it.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a very profound intellectual controversy going on here about the construction of this legislation, and I think we ought to have the help of more Members. I therefore make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. STAFFORD and Mr. RUCKER to act as tellers.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 13, noes 47.

So the motion to rise was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote discloses the lack of a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Alexander	Fairchild, R. L.	Key, Ohio	Robinson
Anthony	Fairchild, G. W.	Kraus	Rodenberg
Bankhead	Fess	Kreider	Rowe
Bland	Fields	La Follette	Rowland
Brodbeck	Flynn	LaGuardia	Sabath
Buchanan	Fordney	Lee, Ga.	Sanders, N. Y.
Butler	Foss	Lenroot	Sanford
Caldwell	Freeman	McClintic	Scott, Pa.
Campbell, Pa.	Fuller, Mass.	McCormick	Scully
Cantrill	Gallivan	McCulloch	Sears
Capstick	Garland	McFadden	Sells
Carew	Glass	McKenzie	Small
Chandler, N. Y.	Goodall	McKeown	Smith, C. B.
Church	Gould	McKinley	Smith, T. F.
Clark, Fla.	Graham, Pa.	Madden	Snyder
Clark, N. J.	Gray, N. J.	Mann	Stephens, Nebr.
Coady	Greene, Vt.	Meeker	Stevenson
Cooper, Ohio	Hamill	Miller, Minn.	Sullivan
Copley	Hamilton, N. Y.	Moore, Ind.	Switzer
Costello	Harrison, Va.	Morin	Talbot
Crago	Hayden	Mott	Templeton
Crisp	Heaton	Mudd	Treadway
Curry, Mich.	Heintz	Neely	Van Dyke
Curry, Cal.	Holland	Norton	Vare
Davidson	Hollingsworth	Parker, N. Y.	Voigt
Dies	Hood	Peters	Walker
Doelling	Howard	Phelan	Watson, Va.
Doughton	Hull, Tenn.	Platt	White, Ohio
Draue	Husted	Porter	Wilson, Ill.
Drukker	James	Pou	Wilson, La.
Dunn	Johnson, S. Dak.	Powers	Winslow
Eagan	Jones, Va.	Ragsdale	Wise
Eagle	Kahn	Rahney	Wood, Ind.
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Riordan	Woodyard
Estepinal	Kennedy, R. I.	Roberts	Zihman

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 10358, the legislative appropriation bill, and finding itself without a quorum, had directed the roll to be called, when 289 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he handed in the names of the absentees for publication in the Journal.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 107, line 4, after the word "pullers," strike out "at \$480 each" and insert after the word "apportionment," in line 5, the words "at \$480 each."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of building for the Civil Service Commission, \$16,875.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of making an inquiry. Why is the Civil Service Commission in this item in the bill? Do they not occupy a building that is constructed by the Government?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; they do not. They have a five-year lease of a building they occupy on F Street, and this is the contract price.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Office, Postmaster General: Postmaster General, \$12,000; chief clerk, including \$500 as superintendent of buildings, \$4,000; private secretary, \$2,500; disbursing clerk, \$2,250; appointment clerk, assistant to chief clerk, confidential clerk to Postmaster General, and chairman, board of inspection, at \$2,000 each; chief inspector, \$4,000; chief clerk to chief inspector, \$2,000; purchasing agent, \$4,000; chief clerk to purchasing agent, \$2,000; assistant attorneys—1 \$3,000, 1 \$2,500; 3 at \$2,000 each; bond examiner, \$2,500; law clerk, \$1,800; clerks—86 of class 4, 130 of class 3, 200 of class 2, 246 of class 1, 183 at \$1,000 each, 31 at \$900 each; skilled draftsmen—3 at \$1,800 each, 8 at \$1,600 each, 5 at \$1,400 each, 8 at \$1,200 each; map mounter, \$1,200; assistant map mounter, \$1,000; blue printer, \$900; assistant blue printer, \$840; telegrapher, \$1,500; typewriter repairer, \$1,200; 3 telephone switchboard operators; 2 messengers in charge of mails at \$900 each; 22 messengers; 35 assistant messengers; captain of the watch, \$1,200; additional to 3 watchmen acting as lieutenant of watchmen, at \$120 each; 34 watchmen; 2 engineers, at \$1,200 each; 9 assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; 2 blacksmiths or steamfitters, at \$1,000 each; 3 oilers, at \$840 each; 15 firemen; 20 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; chief engineer, \$1,600; assistant electricians—2 at \$1,200 each, 3 at \$1,000 each; 2 dynamo tenders, at \$900 each; carpenters—1 \$1,400, 3 at \$1,000 each; awning maker, painter, and plumber, at \$1,000 each; assistant plumber, \$900; laborers—foreman \$900, assistant foreman \$840, 2 at \$840 each, 76 at \$720 each, 3 at \$660 each; female laborers—1 \$540, 3 at \$500 each, 9 at \$480 each; 58 charwomen; actual and necessary expenses of the purchasing agent while traveling on business of the department, \$500; in all, \$1,459,690.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee in regard to the item in line 17, page 118. What is the pay the 58 charwomen get in salary?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They get \$240 a year, the customary salary.

Mr. LOBECK. Two hundred and forty dollars a year?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Two hundred and forty dollars a year, \$20 a month. That is the statutory salary paid to charwomen.

Mr. LOBECK. Oh, no; they are paying in the Treasury Department more than that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. What is that?

Mr. LOBECK. They are paying more in the Treasury Department. The custodians of these same buildings are paying more money than that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Only in case where they are working all day, but not where they are working as these do from two not to exceed three hours in the evening or early in the morning in cleaning up the rooms.

Mr. LOBECK. Does the gentleman mean to say they only work two or three hours?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is about all; about two or three hours; just as the charwomen in the House Office Building do, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. LOBECK. But where they are working four or five hours they are getting more pay than that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand these women work two or three hours a day.

Mr. LOBECK. Well, the women in the Federal buildings under the direction of the Treasury Department, also in the Post Office Buildings are getting at the present time \$25 a month. In New York City they are getting \$325 a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOBECK. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. For how many hours a day do they work?

Mr. LOBECK. They are supposed to work between four and five hours.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, even those in this instance where they are apparently receiving a higher compensation are not receiving proportionately as much as we are paying them here in the District. The testimony in the hearings of various chief clerks of whom we have asked, and we have asked several chief clerks, who have charge usually of the employment of these charwomen, that the time of the employment was usually two or three hours, rarely three, generally two to two and a half hours on the average.

Mr. LOBECK. I looked over the hearings, and I did not find anything in the hearings bearing on the subject.

I find in the payment of salaries of laborers in the Post Office Department they are paid \$70 a month. In the Treasury Department they are paying \$50 to \$55 for the same service—that is, this Government is—we are paying for the women who are acting as charwomen in the Treasury Department in the same building, doing the same kind of work, and working the same hours as in the Post Office Department at the rate of \$25 a month. There is a bill now before Congress to increase that pay to \$35 a month for the women, instead of \$25. I think \$20 a month is too small a wage, and if it were proper to add an amendment—although I am afraid it would go out on the point of order—to increase the wages, I would do so; but I think it is wrong to pay these women—I do not care whether they work two or three hours in a day mopping the floors and cleaning up—only \$20 per month, and most of these people have to pay car fare.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. LOBECK. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Are these women who get this small compensation for the two or three hours' work employed in any other department so that they work continuously all day long?

Mr. LOBECK. I do not think so.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are instances, if the gentleman will permit, where charwomen employed in one department in the early morning are employed at another department late in the evening or in the early evening hours.

Mr. HICKS. It practically makes continuous labor?

Mr. STAFFORD. The testimony is that most of this labor is performed by women who are heads of families. They go to the departments in the early hours and return home in time to arrange matters in the home, the cooking and the like.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LOBECK. Do they not return in the evening and finish the work they started in the morning?

Mr. STAFFORD. The testimony is that these women either come in the early morning or in the afternoon. If they perform service during the entire day of six hours, their compensation as fixed in this bill is \$480, which is double that for the two and three hour period, for which we pay them \$240.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman from Nebraska permit me to interrogate the gentleman from Wisconsin in his time?

Mr. LOBECK. I will.

Mr. HICKS. Do I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin to say that these women have practically continuous service throughout the day?

Mr. STAFFORD. No. So far as I have been able to glean from the testimony, they are employed only once a day for two or three hours and then return home and perform their duties there. There are instances, however, where some charwomen are employed in two different departments, in two different shifts, for which they receive double the salary, or \$480.

Mr. HICKS. That is, for two shifts?

Mr. LOBECK. Do they receive pay in one department first and then in another?

Mr. STAFFORD. Exactly.

Mr. LOBECK. I have looked for the testimony in the hearings, but was not able to find it. I am glad to get the information.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would permit me to state my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] is recognized.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on this section because there are two or three items in it that are raises of salary. Of course, this committee had originally no jurisdiction to legislate, but they have done so. But the question of jurisdiction was not made. But under the rules they can not legislate in an appropriation bill. I think the point of order can be well sustained to the words "\$3,000," on line 18, page 117, and on two or three smaller items that I do not care to make the point of order on.

Now, the increase here is very small, and it might have gone by unnoticed, but I desire to direct the attention of the House to the policy that is involved in this matter. This committee can not legislate. It ought not to undertake to raise salaries in this bill. It has no power to do that. But I realize, further, the fact that the Committee on Appropriations itself is not so much to blame when the representatives of the Post Office Department go before it and seek an increase of the salaries of officers in that department.

Now, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has authority, and it is the only committee that has, to legislate for that department. It legislates not only for the Postal Service but for the departmental service, and while it is true that this committee may appropriate for departmental service but not for the Postal Service, yet it must appropriate in accordance with existing law. The representatives, as I said, of the Post Office Department go to the committee and ask for these increases, however.

They ought to go to the committee that is provided by law to determine them, and if they go there and do not get them they ought not to circumvent the jurisdiction of the committee that has control of legislation in reference to the Post Office Department by bringing the question again—or for the first time, as it may be—before the Appropriations Committee, and the Appropriations Committee ought not to submit to such a request. It puts the Post Office Department in bad attitude in reference to legislation, both as to the two committees and as to the House, and it ought to be rebuked. And while I do not know the officer who is getting a little increase of \$250, and while that may not amount to very much, and it may be that it is due him, the place for him to get that increase under the law, if he is entitled to it, is before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, in my judgment. Therefore I make the point of order on the words that I have read.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the point of order which I understand the gentleman to make is directed to an increase of salary of the assistant solicitor from \$2,750 to \$3,000. The point of order is unquestionably good. I am very glad indeed to know that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon]

has had a change of heart in regard to legislation on appropriation bills, for I think if the record is investigated it will be found that a year ago when the Post Office appropriation bill was presented to this Congress, coming from his committee and under his charge, it contained more legislation upon an appropriation bill than any other appropriation bill that has been introduced in this House since I have been a Member of it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this, in justice to the committee: The Postmaster General has been making a reorganization of his department ever since he has been Postmaster General. He has done that with the result of reducing the number of employees in his department by 189 persons, drawing salaries aggregating \$174,360. In other words, the Postmaster General—

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will excuse me, I will make this statement.

Mr. RUCKER. I will excuse you.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In other words, the action of the Postmaster General along this line has resulted in the saving in that one department alone of \$174,360 every year.

Now, the pending bill, Mr. Chairman, under the recommendation and the estimate submitted by the Postmaster General, reduces the number of employees in that department by 37, their aggregate salaries amounting to \$28,120.

Now, the Postmaster General came before the committee with that sort of a record and that sort of a statement, and the statement was made that this assistant solicitor had increased work, and that he acted as solicitor in the absence of the chief solicitor. In addition to that, it was shown that even before the war started there was a considerable natural growth in the volume and importance of the work of the legal officer for the Post Office Department, on account of the necessity for considering cases relating to lotteries and the misuse of the mails in the furtherance of schemes to defraud the public. Since the war, added responsibilities have been imposed upon the office of the solicitor, involving the administration of certain provisions of the espionage and trading with the enemy acts. This particular assistant attorney is doing a great deal of that work.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order is well taken, but this increase is well deserved.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] makes the point of—

Mr. MOON. One moment, Mr. Chairman, there is another point of order to be made here. We have not done with this yet. On page 118, line 1, are the words "telegrapher, \$1,500."

Now, Mr. Chairman, in reply to my friend from Tennessee, I want to say this: Suppose it were true that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads did bring in a bill that had an immense amount of legislation on it. That is no justification for this action. That is begging the question. But the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, when it brought a bill into this House, has had the candor to say to this House, "This is new legislation and is subject to a point of order," at the beginning or else it has asked, in accordance with the rule, for a special rule to make it in order.

The gentleman says there has been great economy effected. Suppose there has been. The gentleman does not insist for a moment that the raising of salaries above what they were in any way contributed to that economy. That was the work of the department, without any intervention on the part of the Committee on Appropriations. The objection I make—and it is one that I think the House ought to well consider—is that these department officials, when they can not get what they want before the proper committee, have no right to go to another committee. They might in this instance just as well have gone to the Committee on Labor or to the Committee on Acoustics as to have gone to this committee. It is a bad practice and we ought to have a rule in this House, if I may be permitted to say it, that will require some respect to be paid to the judgment of this House and its constituted committees.

I am not speaking of the Post Office Department especially, but the practice of all these departments is that when they can not get what they want in one place—in the House—they go to another place, and if they can not get it in the House, they go to the Senate and get it from friendly conferees, finally, and the judgment of this House is thus overridden. There ought to be some rule in this House to protect us in legislation, and it is no part of the functions of this committee to participate in the usurpation of power and authority that belongs to another committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in reference to this particular item for a telegrapher at \$1,500, the salary heretofore was \$1,400. It is proper, perhaps, to raise it to \$1,500. I do not know. If the

gentleman insists upon it, I will withdraw the point of order if he thinks the whole interests of the Republic rest upon this increase by his committee of \$100 to a salary.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman wants to make the point of order on this man getting \$100 increase, he can make it. The committee unanimously felt that in all justice and fairness he ought to have this slight increase.

Mr. MOON. Well, if the gentleman is defiant about it, I will make the point of order.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] is sustained. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Rucker] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members were answered to their names:

Anderson	Eagle	Kelley, Mich.	Reed
Anthony	Edmonds	Kennedy, Iowa	Riordan
Bacharach	Elliott	Key, Ohio	Roberts
Bankhead	Ellsworth	Knutson	Rodenberg
Barnhart	Estepinal	Kraus	Rowe
Beauregard	Evans	Kreider	Rowland
Booher	Fairchild, B. L.	La Follette	Sanders, La.
Borland	Fairchild, G. W.	LaGuardia	Sauford
Brand	Ferris	Lazaro	Schall
Brumbaugh	Fess	Lee, Ga.	Scott, Pa.
Buchanan	Fields	Lenroot	Scully
Butler	Flynn	Longworth	Sears
Campbell, Kans.	Focht	McClintic	Sherwood
Campbell, Pa.	Foss	McCormick	Shouse
Cantrill	Frear	McCulloch	Shlayden
Capstick	Fuller, Mass.	McFadden	Slomp
Carew	Gallivan	McKenzie	Small
Chandler, N. Y.	Gard	McKeown	Smith, Thomas F.
Church	Garland	McKinley	Snell
Clark, Fla.	Garner	McLemore	Snyder
Clark, Pa.	Gillett	Madden	Stedman
Claypool	Good	Magee	Steele
Coady	Goodall	Mann	Steenerson
Collier	Gould	Martin	Stephens, Nebr.
Connely, Kans.	Graham, Pa.	Mason	Stevenson
Cooper, Ohio	Gray, N. J.	Meeker	Sullivan
Copley	Gregg	Miller, Minn.	Switzer
Costello	Hamill	Morin	Talbott
Crago	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mott	Templeton
Cramton	Hamlin	Mudd	Thompson
Crisp	Harrison, Miss.	Nelson	Towner
Currie, Mich.	Hastings	Nichols, Mich.	Treadway
Curry, Cal.	Heaton	Oldfield	Van Dyke
Davidson	Heflin	Padgett	Vare
Dempsey	Helntz	Palge	Walker
Denison	Holland	Parker, N. Y.	Ward
Dewalt	Hollingsworth	Peters	Watson, Va.
Dies	Hood	Phelan	Webb
Doelling	Houston	Platt	White, Ohio
Doellittle	Howard	Polk	Williams
Doremus	Husted	Porter	Wilson, Ill.
Doughton	Ice	Pou	Wilson, La.
Drane	James	Powers	Wise
Drukker	Johnson, S. Dak.	Price	Wood, Ind.
Dunn	Jones, Va.	Purnell	Woods, Iowa
Dupré	Juni	Raessdale	Woodyard
Eagan	Kahn	Ramsey	Young, Tex.
	Kehoe	Rayburn	Zibelman

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, H. R. 10358, found itself without a quorum, whereupon he caused the roll to be called, when 237 Members answered to their names, and he reported the names of the absentees to be printed in the Journal and Record.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The committee will resume its session.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I wish to offer in line 18, page 117, to insert the figures "\$2,750" after the first word "one."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I did not understand where that comes in.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Page 117, line 18, after the first word "one," insert "\$2,750."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. MOON. I reserve a point of order on the amendment for the purpose of asking my colleague if he recollects whether \$2,750 is the amount fixed by the general law for this salary, or was that an increase on an appropriation bill over and above the original amount fixed by the general law?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is the amount fixed by act of Congress passed March 4, 1915.

Mr. MOON. A general statute?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman if that restores the figures of last year?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. As in the preceding case?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. RUCKER), there were—ayes 70, noes none.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, Mr. Chairman, on page 118, after the word "telegrapher," in the first line, I move to insert the figures "\$1,400."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Page 118, line 1, after the word "telegrapher," insert "\$1,400."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

In making readjustments hereunder the salary of any clerk in any class may be fixed by the Postmaster General at \$100 below the salary fixed by law for such class, and the unused portion of such salary shall be used to increase the salary of any clerk in any class entitled thereto by not less than \$100 above the salary fixed by law for such class. The Postmaster General shall assign to the several bureaus, offices, and divisions of the Post Office Department such number of the employees herein authorized as may be necessary to perform the work required therein; and he shall submit a statement showing such assignments and the number employed at the various salaries in the annual Book of Estimates following the estimates for salaries in the Post Office Department.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that paragraph. I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if that section is not new law, beginning with line 21, on page 18, and ending with the word "class," in line 1, on page 119?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that I think the first sentence of the paragraph is clearly subject to a point of order. It was inserted at the instance of the Postmaster General for the first time in the legislative bill last year, so as to enable the Postmaster General to promote or demote a clerk \$100 at a time instead of \$200. He made the statement that in some cases a clerk would not be entitled under his efficiency rating to a \$200 increase, but he would be entitled to a \$100 increase; or in some cases he could make two promotions of \$100 each instead of leaving one clerk at his old salary and promoting another clerk, no more competent, \$200. For that reason he felt that in justice to the employees of the department he ought to have that authority, and the committee inserted it in the bill last year for the first time. There was no objection made to it at that time.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I think the place for the Postmaster General to go to get laws passed in reference to his department is before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and not to these other committees. I make the point of order on lines 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, on page 118, and on line 1, on page 119, down to and including the word "class."

The CHAIRMAN. Has the chairman of the committee anything to say on that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office Fourth Assistant Postmaster General: Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; division of rural mails—superintendent \$3,000, chief clerk \$2,000; division of equipment and supplies—superintendent \$3,000, chief clerk \$2,000; topographer, \$2,400; in all, \$19,900.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the words "two thousand dollars," line 16, page 120.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I will state that that really is a reduction of expenses of this department. There were formerly fixed by statute a division of supplies, with a superintendent at \$2,750, and a division of equipment, with a superintendent at \$2,750. The statute created two divisions and fixed the salary of the two superintendents at \$2,750 each. Under the reorganization the Postmaster General has provided for a division of equipment and supplies, with one superintendent, at \$3,000, which is a reduction of one salary and a rise, of course, of \$250 to the man who takes both divisions.

Mr. ASHBROOK. And one of the most obliging officials in the Post Office Department, Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. We have been so assured, and in view of the fact that the duties are doubled, looking out for two divisions, the Postmaster General felt that he was entitled to the modest increase of \$250, and by that reduction we save \$2,500 to the Government.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, by making a reduction of a few dozen other matters they might save \$25,000 more. The question is, Is this legislation in this bill? The statute provides \$2,750 for the superintendent, and it does not provide for \$3,000. This is one separate and distinct proposition, not connected with anything else. There is nothing on the face of this bill to show that there are any dual duties performed. It is simply proposed to raise the salary from \$2,750 to \$3,000.

Now, I do not care about the amount of salary; that is insignificant. But the idea is that the adjustment of these matters ought to go to the proper committee.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that I am persuaded by what the gentleman from Tennessee has said that this really is in the interest of economy. This is one of the most efficient men in the Post Office Department, and if the gentleman had a district like mine, requiring the work that is done there, he would so view it.

Mr. MOON. Where is this gentleman from?

Mr. RUCKER. I do not know, he is always there. He is not from anywhere. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOON. Is he from Missouri?

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, no; I think he is from Tennessee. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOON. I have made the point of order, Mr. Chairman, and if the gentleman insists on it, it is not very material. I wanted to show to the House that legislation of this sort ought not to be encouraged, but in view of the solicitation of the gentleman from Missouri, and in deference to my friend from Tennessee, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. We have thus far made so many improvements in the bill that I am thoroughly satisfied with it now. I added some very desirable amendments to it myself and therefore if the gentlemen of the committee do not need my assistance any longer I am going to my office. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. How long does the gentleman from Tennessee plan to sit to-night?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit, we want to read 8 or 10 more pages. There are no controverted questions and it will only take a very few minutes. If the gentleman will permit us to get down to a point where we can consider the bill in one more day. The gentleman knows that we have not had an opportunity to read any considerable portion of the bill to-day, and I hope the gentleman will bear with us a few minutes longer.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That surely has been no fault of this side. The gentleman, I understand, proposes to ask to dispense with Calendar Wednesday to-morrow, and it might be well to have the day start in in good humor. Gentlemen have been here all day.

Mr. SHERLEY. These 10 pages will probably be read in 10 minutes. We are not going to get into any controverted matters late to-night.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I suggest that they read up to the Department of Justice.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to read as far as the Department of Commerce.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman indicate how long he intends to run?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that if the committee remains in good humor the reading will be completed very soon. The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses, Post Office Department: For stationery and blank books, index and guide cards, folders, and binding devices, including purchase of free penalty envelopes, \$25,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, there is a typographical error in the spelling of the word "department," in line 19, page 120.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the word will be spelled correctly.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle for official use of the Postmaster General to cost not exceeding \$4,000; purchase and exchange of a motor truck; maintenance, repair, and operation of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle and of motor trucks, to be used only for official purposes, and garage rent, \$7,500.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on this to ask the chairman the purpose of the use of this, and if this is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think it is new legislation; I do not think it is subject to a point of order. I will say to the gentleman that the purpose of this paragraph is to au-

thorize the purchase of an automobile for the official use of the Postmaster General. All Cabinet members are now provided with four horses and from two to four carriages, and the committee has made a thorough investigation and has come to the conclusion that it is a matter of economy to have an automobile instead of the horses. These horses cost from \$30 to \$35 a month each for board, in addition to the stable hire, and the repairs to the carriages, and the cost mounts up. The gentleman will recall that a year ago an automobile was authorized for the Secretary of State, and that automobile was purchased under the same terms provided here for the Postmaster General—and which I may say to the gentleman that has been done for all other Cabinet officials—and the actual facts show, as reported by the chief clerk of the Department of State, that the automobile has cost \$1,000 less to the Government during the year than the horses and carriages.

Mr. ROBBINS. Which automobile saved that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The automobile purchased by the Secretary of State.

Mr. ROBBINS. And now it is proposed to purchase one for the Postmaster General for that reason, is it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. And I may say to the gentleman that we have already provided automobiles in this bill for the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior, and those items have been passed without objection.

Mr. WALSH. But they are not all of the time preaching economy.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And I want to say this in justice to the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General stated to the committee, through his chief clerk, that he did not want an automobile. He said that he preferred the use of the carriage and horses. Later on he came to the committee room and stated that he had been informed by another Cabinet officer that it was the opinion of the committee that money could be saved. Then he said, "While my personal preference is for my horses, yet if the committee thinks that it can save one dollar to the Government, give me an automobile and take my horses and carriages from me."

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman think by expending \$4,000 for an automobile that the Government is going to save money?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is no question about the matter of saving, if the gentleman will look into it.

Mr. WALSH. Does it cost \$4,000 to keep that span of horses?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Those horses will be sold. Their upkeep will cost much more than the automobile will cost.

Mr. ROBBINS. Who owns the horses and carriages now?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Government owns the horses and carriages. Let me say to the gentleman that it costs from \$30 to \$35 a month to board each one of those four horses. It cost nearly \$2,600 last year to maintain the horses and carriages and expenses incident thereto of the Postmaster General. Does the gentleman think that it will cost \$2,600 to maintain an automobile?

Mr. ROBBINS. If it costs \$2,600 to maintain the horses, what will it cost to buy gasoline and hire a couple of chauffeurs?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The \$2,600 does not take into consideration the cost of the drivers. It is simply the board of the horses and the cost of maintaining the vehicles, and purchasing horses when needed to take the places of those which die or become worthless.

Mr. ROBBINS. I think \$2,600 is entirely too much to contribute to the mere board of horses.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman knows that it costs a great deal to board horses now, and the statement was made to the committee—

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-five Members are present, not a quorum, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman from Tennessee want to move to rise?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think we ought to have some understanding about finishing this bill.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota moves that the committee rise.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. NORTON) there were—yeas 40, noes 39.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Tellers, Mr. Chairman. Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers [Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee and Mr. NORTON] reported that there were—ayes 32, noes 46.

So the motion to rise was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. On this vote the ayes are 32, the noes are 46, a quorum is not present, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anderson	Fairchild, B. L.	Kitchin	Robinson
Anthony	Fairchild, G. W.	Knutson	Rosenberg
Ayres	Ferris	Kraus	Rouse
Bacharach	Fess	Kroder	Rowe
Bankhead	Fields	La Follette	Rowland
Barkley	Fisher	LatGuardia	Rucker
Barnhart	Flynn	Lazaro	Russell
Beckes	Focht	Lee, Ga.	Sanders, La.
Bell	Fordney	Leandro	Sanford
Blackmon	Foss	Lever	Schall
Borland	Frear	Linthicum	Scott, Mich.
Britten	Freeman	Little	Scott, Pa.
Browne	Fuller, Ill.	Longman	Scully
Brumbaugh	Fuller, Mass.	Longworth	Sears
Buchanan	Gallagher	Lunn	Sells
Burnett	Gallivan	McClintic	Shallenberger
Butler	Gard	McCormick	Sherwood
Byrnes, S. C.	Garland	McCulloch	Shouse
Caldwell	Garner	McFadden	Sims
Campbell, Kans.	Gillett	McKenzie	Slayden
Campbell, Pa.	Good	McKeown	Small
Cantrill	Goodall	McKinley	Smith, Mich.
Capstick	Gough	McLemore	Smith, C. B.
Car, W.	Graham, Ill.	Madden	Smith, T. F.
Carter, Mass.	Graham, Pa.	Magee	Snell
Chandler, N. Y.	Gray, N. J.	Mann	Snyder
Church	Green, Iowa	Martin	Stedman
Clark, Fla.	Gregg	Mason	Steele
Clark, Pa.	Hamill	Mays	Steenerson
Clason	Hamilton, Mich.	Meeker	Stephens, Miss.
Claypool	Hamilton, N. Y.	Merritt	Stephens, Nebr.
Coady	Hamlin	Miller, Minn.	Sterling, Pa.
Connelly, Kans.	Hardy	Mondell	Stevenson
Cooper, Ohio	Harrison, Miss.	Montague	Stiness
Cooper, Wis.	Horton	Morin	Sullivan
Coppy	Hunt	Mott	Switzer
Costello	Heintz	Nelson	Talbott
Crago	Housley	Nicholls, S. C.	Taylor, Colo.
Cramton	Hersey	Nolan	Temple
Crisp	Hicks	Oldfield	Templeton
Curtis, Mich.	Holland	Olney	Thompson
Curry, Cal.	Hollingsworth	O'Shaunnessy	Townner
Davidson	Hood	Owmyer	Treadway
Dempsey	Houston	Padgett	Var
Dent	Howard	Paice	Walker
Dewalt	Hull, Iowa	Park	Walton
Dickinson	Hull, Tenn.	Parker, N. Y.	Ward
Dies	Husted	Peters	Watson, Va.
Doelling	James	Phelan	Weaver
Doollittle	Johnson, Ky.	Platt	Webb
Doremus	Johnson, S. Dak.	Polk	Whaley
Doughton	Johnson, Wash.	Porter	White, Ohio
Drukner	Jones, Va.	Pou	Wilson, Ill.
Dunn	Juhl	Powers	Wilson, La.
Dupré	Kahn	Price	Winslow
Egan	Kehoe	Purnell	Wise
Eagle	Kelley, Mich.	Ragdale	Wood, Ind.
Edmonds	Kelly, Pa.	Ralney	Woodyard
Elliott	Kennedy, Iowa	Ramsey	Young, Tex.
Ellsworth	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramsayer	Zihlman
Elston	Kettner	Rayburn	
Extopinal	Key, Ohio	Reed	
Evans	Kinkaid	Roberts	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, finding itself without a quorum, under the rule he caused the roll to be called, whereupon 179 Members, a quorum, answered to their names, and he reported the list of absentees to be entered upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] has a point of order pending.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on this section, in line 3, beginning with the word "for" and ending in line 5 with the semicolon.

The CHAIRMAN. What page?

Mr. TAGUE. Page 121.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. What part of the bill?

Mr. TAGUE. Page 121, lines 3 to 5.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. To the whole paragraph?

Mr. TAGUE. No; ending with the figures, "\$4,000."

Mr. NORTON. On what does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman leaves in the maintenance of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle. The gentleman's point of order would strike out the automobile and leave in the maintenance.

Mr. TAGUE. I make the point of order to the whole section.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

After line 2 insert the following: "For purchase, exchange, and maintenance of horses and horse-drawn, passenger-carrying vehicles, purchase of a motor truck, repair of vehicles including motor trucks and harness, \$3,200."

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. I want to ask the chairman of the committee—

Mr. SHERLEY. Let us have the point of order determined, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. NORTON. I make the point of order.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. NORTON. I make the point of order that that part providing for the purchase of a motor truck is new legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order for just one minute?

Mr. SHERLEY. Let us get it passed upon. If the point of order is to be made, let us get rid of it and get along with the bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will state that this provision has been carried in the bill heretofore. If gentlemen are going to deny to the department a motor truck, necessary to carry supplies from point to point, and similar facilities, I do not know how the department is going to operate. Now, it seems to me that the gentleman ought to take into consideration the fact that this department needs some vehicle of this kind.

Mr. TAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. TAGUE. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is not aware that the Post Office Committee gave the Post Office Department \$400,000 for new automobiles?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And not a dollar of that sum can be expended in the District of Columbia, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. TAGUE. I would like to ask the gentleman where the automobiles that are in the District will come from?

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit? Not one dollar may be spent in the departmental service, but any amount can be spent in connection with the Postal Service in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true so far as the Postal Service is concerned, but not one dollar can be spent in connection with the departmental service.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield? I want to get some information. Does this provide—

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is the point of order.

Mr. NORTON. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if the bill provides that the money hereby appropriated for the maintenance of these motor trucks shall be used in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is so provided, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan, in the bill later on. There is a provision to cover that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I insist on the motion. I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I call for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 37, noes 40.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I raise the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of no quorum. Evidently there is not a quorum present, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think, Mr. Chairman, there is a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not, but the Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appropriations made for the service of the Post Office Department in conformity with the act of July 2, 1836, shall not be expended for any of the purposes herein provided for on account of the Post Office Department at Washington, D. C.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who has had to leave the Hall on account of illness, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 1854, commonly known as the daylight-saving bill, may have a privileged status.

DAYLIGHT SAVING.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who has had to leave the Hall on account of illness, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 1854, commonly known as the daylight-saving bill, may have a privileged status.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] asks unanimous consent that the daylight-saving bill, so called, S. 1854, shall have a privileged status.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 13, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting tentative amendments to H. R. 9390, a bill to promote the efficiency of the Navy, and for other purposes (H. Doc. No. 968); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of an increase of \$900,000 to the estimate of appropriation heretofore submitted for collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 969); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8764) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Illinois into the Union, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 372), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5351) providing for the disposal of certain lands in block 32, in the city of Port Angeles, State of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 373), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 171) to repeal the last proviso of section 4 of an act to establish the Rocky Mountain National Park, in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, approved January 26, 1915, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 374), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10658) to provide for the building and testing of the Slate gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 10659) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United

States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 10660) to amend an act entitled "An act in reference to the expatriation of citizens and their protection abroad," approved March 2, 1907; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 10661) to provide for the appointment of two additional judges of the District Court of the United States for the Northeastern District of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 10662) to authorize the judges of the United States Court of Customs Appeals to be assigned to any district or circuit court of appeals of the United States and conferring the jurisdiction of said courts upon them while so assigned; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON: A bill (H. R. 10663) to convey a strip of land on the site of Federal building at Princeton, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10664) to empower the Secretary of War to grant furloughs to enlisted men engaged in agriculture and other industries intimately related to winning the war for such periods as he may designate to engage in such industries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 10665) to establish a bureau for the study of the criminal, pauper, and defective classes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 10691) to amend section 5200 of the Revised Statutes as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALDOW: Resolution (H. Res. 272) for the restoration of the rural mail routes in the county of Erie, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WELTY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 264) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 265) providing for an increase of pay to the custodian employees of the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLASSON: A bill (H. R. 10666) for the relief of Johanna Dunton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DENTON: A bill (H. R. 10667) granting a pension to Thomas R. Poole; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 10668) granting a pension to Georgia A. Colony; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10669) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Wint; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10670) granting a pension to Hattie M. Wescott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10671) granting a pension to Mary E. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10672) granting a pension to Anna B. Kenyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10673) granting a pension to Kate M. Bingham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10674) granting an increase of pension to William Bowen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 10675) granting an increase of pension to James H. Nale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10676) granting an increase of pension to John Linguist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 10677) granting an increase of pension to William W. Agee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10678) granting an increase of pension to Henry Burcham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 10679) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo C. Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 10680) granting an increase of pension to David C. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 10681) granting a pension to Philip M. Earle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 10682) granting a pension to Ellen E. Greenfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 10683) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Jack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 10684) granting a pension to Charles E. Keck; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10685) granting a pension to Clarinda L. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10686) granting an increase of pension to George A. Burgess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10687) granting an increase of pension to Cora Fannie Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 10688) granting an increase of pension to John Pierstock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10689) granting a pension to Alexander Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 10690) granting an increase of pension to David F. Hodges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 10692) granting a pension to Patrick Macdonnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 10693) granting an increase of pension to Tony K. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of board of management, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, against increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petitions of Oakland Farmers' Club and other farm clubs of the State of Missouri, asking that the Government fix a price on meats and grain; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of New York Board of Trade and Transportation, relative to perpetual Federal railroad control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of National Live Stock Shippers' Protective League, favoring continuing rates and charges under Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Manhattan Single-Tax Club, of New York, favoring 160 acres of land for men in the military and naval service of the country; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Joshua L. Bailey & Co., of New York, favoring passage of the daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE of Vermont: Petition of Rev. Clarence L. Eaton, of St. Johnsbury, Vt., favoring the passage of H. R. 5407, for the admission of osteopathic physicians to examinations for commissions in the medical branch of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: Memorial of council of the Chicago Medical Society, indorsing House bill 9563; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Federal Board of Farm Organizations, in reference to amendment of draft regulations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the North End Business Men's Association of Chicago, favoring increased compensation for post-office employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Loyal Order of Moose, for the Garland bill (H. R. 7364) to reincorporate the Loyal Order of Moose in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Sewing Machine Co., of Belvidere, Ill., that corporation income and excess taxes may be paid in quarterly installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Resolution of the carpenters' convention of the State of Massachusetts, asking the Shipping Board to commandeer all shipyards doing Government work, and asking that the President provide equal representation of labor on all commissions dealing with labor problems; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRIEST: Resolution of the Lancaster Typographical Union, No. 70, urging the enactment of the old-age-pension law; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Resolutions of the Grace Lutheran Church and the Grace Baptist Church, of San Jose, Cal., urging immediate prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the board of governors of the Investment Bankers' Association of America, favoring the principle of the

war finance corporation bill and suggesting changes that should be made; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Letter from Denver Typographical Union, No. 49, indorsing Sherwood old-age pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, letter from Colorado Prison Association, indorsing Senate bill 3076; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of T. D. Hetherington, William Honeyman, A. C. McGuire, Harold R. Smith, J. J. Ashenburt, Dr. O. W. Spicer, R. E. Cook, R. A. Arens, T. B. Johnson, George R. Crow, Percy Parker, William Stevens, and John A. Frazer, all of Colorado Springs, Colo., urging immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution of Providence (R. I.) Medical Society, urging passage of Senate bill 3748 and House bill 9563, creating advance rank for officers of Medical Corps in United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Surry Lumber Co., of Baltimore, Md., favoring passage of Senate bill 5426, relative to President taking over timberlands and sawmills during the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of John J. Reitz, of Baltimore, Md., favoring passage of House bill 5531, relative to pharmacists in United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Maryland Association for the Prevention and Relief of Tuberculosis, favoring passage of House bill 9663, to manufacture war munitions in prison shops; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Anna Maria Thomas, Washington, D. C., favoring passage of the bill to retire Government clerks; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Railway Mail Association, third division, Baltimore Branch, urging increased pay for railway mail employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of William A. Marburg; Strouse & Bros.; William H. Whitridge; Armstrong, Cator & Co.; Sappington & Moffit; Gomprecht & Benesch, M. S. Levy & Sons (Inc.); William A. Dickey; Swindell Bros.; the Automobile Club of Maryland; and C. Thomas Kemp, all of Baltimore, Md., protesting against House bill 8565, taxing automobiles \$25 per year; also, petitions of Joseph F. Hanselman, president of the Woodstock College, favoring House bill 9223 exempting educational legacies from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of 4,000 Socialist Party members in Minnesota protesting against 20 years court-martial sentence at Camp Dodge of Allan Broms, Morris Kamman, and six other conscientious objectors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths and Helpers Local Union No. 205, Minneapolis, Minn., asking that Government ownership of railroads be given serious consideration at this time; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, petition of Electrical Workers' Union No. 202, Minneapolis, Minn., requesting that no time be fixed when the railroads shall be returned to private ownership, leaving the question for future determination; also requesting increased pay for Government employees; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, petition of International Association of Machinists legislative committee, State of Minnesota, requesting no action be taken as to future date for returning railroads to private ownership, and asking a referendum on the question; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of the daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANFORD: Papers to accompany House bill 9142, granting a pension to William E. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Igloo No. 15, Pioneers of Alaska, asking for the development of the coal and oil resources of Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAGUE: Resolutions adopted by the Massachusetts State Council of Carpenters and Joiners of America, regarding the system of awarding contracts to shipbuilding concerns on the "cost-plus" basis; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions adopted by the bituminous operators committee of the Wholesale Coal Trade Association of New York, on the food bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.